

# Modern Philology

VOLUME XI

October 1913

NUMBER 2

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ANALYTIC GENITIVE IN GERMANIC

The appearance of Mr. Bradley's *The Making of English* in 1904 brought to the writer of this article several very delightful hours and a little later great unrest of mind and much weary labor, for the two pages 59 and 60 treating of the origin of the English analytic genitive with "of" presented views quite different from those which had for years been slowly ripening in the course of his own investigations. Among other things Mr. Bradley says: "We do not know whether, apart from French influence, the English language would not have evolved this convenient device for obviating the ambiguities arising from the decay of the old inflections; but imitation of French idiom certainly helped it attain currency." The opinion of a scholar like Mr. Bradley had considerable weight and views scarcely formed and not yet securely established began to totter. Moreover, Mr. Bradley is very fair in giving credit to both native English tendencies and the foreign influence of French. Nevertheless his words did not bring peace. Old thoughts returned and demanded a new hearing. To restore harmony once more the writer took up work again on this subject. It soon became evident that the analytic genitive did not spring at once into being. It had a very modest beginning. It was at first only occasionally used instead of the old simple synthetic genitive. Thus its history is intimately connected with the history of the older synthetic form. It became perfectly clear to the writer

that the meaning and growth of the new form could be understood only in the light of the meaning and the growth and decline of the old form. Thus, before we take up the study of the first beginnings of the analytic form, a brief history of the older synthetic genitive is here given.

Scholars would fain penetrate the darkness that surrounds the origin of the genitive case, but up to the present nothing whatever has been discovered. We do not even know whether its original use was adnominal or adverbial. As, however, the new analytic genitive, which has similar meanings and exactly the same functional force as the older synthetic genitive, is of adverbial origin, it is quite possible that this is also true of the origin of the synthetic form. While the synthetic genitive is more used than any other case to modify nouns, it was also in former periods freely used with verbs and adjectives. Only in recent times has it become restricted almost exclusively to adnominal use. On the other hand, the new analytic genitive is freely used with both nouns and verbs. In a study of the genitive it is important to remember that there has always been a close relation here between adverbial and adnominal functions. This can best be illustrated by showing the relation between adverbial and adnominal function in the new synthetic genitive which has developed in historic times where the stages of development are open to study. Thus in the following sentence *hinz* (hin ze) *got* has probably still adverbial force: "Swer die minne *hinz got* hat daz er durch sine hulde alle dise welt versmaht . . . daz ist . . . diu heilige gots minne" (*Altdeutsche Predigten*, III, 119, thirteenth century), "If anyone has his love directed to God so that he for His favor despises this world, that is truly the holy love of God." Here *ze got* may be, perhaps, more closely related to the verb than to the governing noun *minne*, but it was often felt as belonging to the governing noun and in that case it ceased to be an adverbial element and became an adnominal adjunct, the modern representative of the older objective genitive, as in "Die Liebe zur *Freiheit* [instead of the older genitive *der Freiheit*] wohnt im Herzen."

Although the development is usually perfectly clear in case of the new analytic genitive the development of the older synthetic genitive is wrapped in darkness. Thus in the Middle High German

sentence quoted in the preceding paragraph nothing is known of the origin of the objective genitive *gots*. The genitive in *gots minne* is usually explained as an objective genitive, which is a development of the possessive genitive, and *minne* is interpreted as having passive force. Thus the expression would mean "God's being loved," or "the love of God," i.e., love which God possesses in a passive sense, not love that God has, feels, but love which God has, receives as a passive recipient. There is, however, another view as to the origin of the objective genitive: "Der subjektive Genitiv ist nur eine Abart des Genitivs poss., der objektive hat ein eigentümlichere Bedeutung. Er berührt sich mit den Genitiven, die zu einem durch ein Substantivum bestimmten Verbum als weitere Bestimmung hinzutreten: Johannes vollzog die Taufe Christi = er vollzog die Taufe an Christus" (Wilmanns, *Deutsche Grammatik*, III, 600). According to this theory the objective genitive was originally an adverbial genitive of reference or specification: "With reference to Christ John performed the baptism." This theory explains a large number of objective genitives. Thus *gots minne* would mean "love with reference to God," or "love of God." It may possibly be that the objective genitive is of composite origin, sometimes a possessive genitive, sometimes a genitive of specification. The adverbial genitive of specification also has often seemingly close relation to the attributive possessive genitive: "We sceolon us gearcian on eallum pingun swa swa Godes penas . . . on micclum gepylde . . . on fæstenum, and on clænnysse *modes* and *licaman*" (Aelfric, "The First Sunday in Lent," tenth century), "We should prepare ourselves just as God's disciples by patience, by fasting, and by cleanliness of *mind* and *body*." Are *modes* and *licaman* possessive genitives or adverbial genitives of specification? We find the same ambiguity in modern German: "die Gleichheit der Gesinnungen," "der Unterschied der Jahre," "ein Muster der Trefflichkeit." In years gone by the writer had definite ideas as to the growth and development of the synthetic genitive and ready explanations for the most puzzling genitive constructions. Today these speculations seem to him perfectly idle, for we do not know anything about the *origin* of the genitive and hence cannot construct any trustworthy theories of its development.

Although the writer is not disposed to enter upon the question of the *development* of the different synthetic genitive categories, he believes that a close study of the *meaning* of these categories is very helpful. The English genitive reached its culmination in the ninth century, while it still flourished in almost full power in the thirteenth century in Germany, even in simple *prose*. At this time the genitive had in both countries developed a rich store of meanings which were identical in the two languages. It could indicate source, cause, authorship, possession, the subject, the object, material, composition, quality, characteristic, measure, the appositive idea, the partitive idea, means, removal, separation, deprivation, specification, a goal, and still other shades of meaning. It meant so much that it often didn't mean anything at all. The constructive force that built the genitive categories up, the feeling for fine shades of meaning, now began to tear them down. There arose in all the Germanic peoples a longing for a clearer and more concrete expression of these ideas. The genitive had the great disadvantage that its original force was not known. It did not convey a vivid concrete picture of any kind. Over against the vague idea of *separation* contained in the colorless genitive stood the clear forceful preposition "of" in English, *von* in German, *af* in Swedish, *de* in Late Latin and French, etc. The writer in earlier years misunderstood this common development in the direction of greater clearness and concrete force. To him then it was deterioration, decay. Today this destruction seems only intelligent reconstruction. There is, however, a grave danger here. The too extensive use of the expressive prepositions may in time destroy the vividness and forcefulness of their original meaning. They often are thoughtlessly used to replace the synthetic form in its many categories without regard to the meaning of the preposition. Thus the preposition becomes loaded down with too many meanings as was formerly the simple genitive. French has gone too far in this direction. English has gone far enough. German is fortunate in retaining the old synthetic form in such large measure. For many years the writer has studied the German development of the last century. From an extensive collection of materials it is entirely clear that there is in a number of cases a tendency in the present literary language to prefer the simple genitive to the use of *von* where this



preposition once seemed to threaten the life of the synthetic form. The large decrease of the use of the German simple genitive in adverbial function has made it more available for forceful use in the adnominal relation. Although, however, the use of the simple genitive has decreased here in adverbial function, many felicitous compounds preserve the older formation: *wesensähnlich*, *mannstoll geistesumnachtet*, etc. The writer takes no stock in the cheap fun that has often been poked at German compounds. He admires the union of simple beauty and strength in English, but he is not blind to the beauties in other languages. He loves to find them and feel them. He has often paused in reading German to muse over a compound with the pronounced feeling that the Germans here are great masters and that English would be richer today if it had not destroyed so much of its former wealth. Alas, the destruction mentioned above was not always intelligent reconstruction! We now turn to a detailed study of the development of the new analytic genitive in the different Germanic languages.

In tracing the development of the analytic genitive it is desirable to begin with the oldest examples of the new usage. It is, however, quite difficult to draw the line between adnominal and adverbial function as nicely illustrated by the use of the words in italics in the following sentence: "manna *us pizai managein* ufwopida qipands" (Wulfila, Luke 9:38), "a man *of the company* cried out saying" (King James Version). According to the King James Version the words are undoubtedly adnominal, an analytic partitive genitive. Both the use of the preposition "of" and the position of the verb show this. The verb follows the subject and its modifiers. In Gothic, however, the position of the verb could not decide this question, for it does not of necessity follow the subject *immediately*. The words "*us pizai managein*" may modify the verb as well as the subject. This difficulty is a serious one and the writer believes that it was felt in the older periods as such and gradually led to the establishment of the verb in the first place after the subject and its modifiers. This new word-order has, in general, become fixed in both English and German. In English it led to a still further step, as becomes evident by comparing the above sentence from the King James Version with the following form from the Corpus Version

1000 A.D.: "pa clypode an wer *of þære menego*." Here the words "of þære menego" may easily be an analytic partitive genitive belonging to *wer*, for the new genitive is quite common at this date, but it may also be considered as an adverbial element modifying the verb. The adnominal genitive with "of" was originally an adverbial form. Perhaps it stood originally between the subject and the verb just as the Gothic words "us pizai managein" in this same passage. It became adnominal when it was felt as belonging to the subject more than to the verb. The *form*, however, was at first adverbial. In 1000 A.D. when the Corpus Version arose there was as yet no differentiation between "of" in adnominal function and "of" used adverbially. Thus the words "of þære menego" from the Corpus Version are ambiguous. Later to give the words adnominal force they were placed immediately after the subject and before the verb, as in the King James Version, and to give them adverbial force they were placed after the verb and the form "of" was replaced by "from" or "from out": "Then a man cried *from out* the crowd." When an adverb introduces the sentence as in this example the German cannot follow the English in placing the subject and its modifier *before* the verb, but must place both *after* the verb: "Da rief ein Mann *unter dem Volk*" (adnominal element), but "Da rief ein Mann *aus dem Volkshaufen heraus*" (adverbial element). The preposition distinguishes the two elements.

A careful study of the preceding paragraph will make it perfectly plain that it is very difficult to determine accurately when the new analytic genitive arose, as it was at first adverbial in *form* and could not be distinguished from an adverbial element by any formal sign either in the words themselves or in the word-order. The new English word-order often seems to present a good test as illustrated in the preceding paragraph, but in the older periods the older word-order existed alongside the new and nothing definite can be determined by this test, and the writer absolutely rejects it as too untrustworthy for scientific purposes. It may easily be that the first beginnings of the analytic form belong to the Gothic or the prehistoric period. Although we cannot assign dates and cannot always distinguish the adnominal relation from the adverbial, there are nevertheless clear indications that the new genitive was developing. By comparing

the Gothic Testament with the Corpus Version we find that a very large number of Gothic adnominal genitives are represented in the English of 1000 A.D. by the analytic form with "of." Here we are on a fairly safe ground. What Wulfila considered adnominal and translated by the synthetic genitive, which cannot in most cases be possibly interpreted as belonging to the verb, is often rendered in the Corpus Version by the analytic genitive with "of." Many of Wulfila's expressions with adverbial form may also be adnominal, but here there exists a good deal of doubt. On the other hand, the expressions with the synthetic genitive in connection with a noun are probably in every single case true adnominal elements, and if we find in the Corpus Version the form with "of," in these same passages we may be quite sure that we have the new genitive before us. A few parallel passages from the two documents are here given for careful study. Partitive genitive: "anparuh pan *siponje* is qap du imma" (Matt. 8:21), "ða cwæð to him oper of hys *leorningcnihtum*," "Another of his disciples said unto him"; "gasaihwandans sumans *pize siponje* is" (Mark 7:2), "pa hi gisawon sume of his *leorningcnihtum*," "When they saw some of his disciples"; "Sahwazuh saei gamarzai ainana *pize leitane*" (Mark 9:42), "Swa hwa swa gedrefð ænne of *pyssum lytlingum*," "Whosoever shall offend one of these little ones." This is a very common group and is already not infrequent in the prose of the ninth century both in Germany and in England. In Latin we find the same tendency. If there has been any foreign force at work at this point on the development of the analytic form in English and German it is the influence of Latin. English and German translators often follow the Latin literally. The fact, however, that this development is stronger in dialect than in the literary language shows clearly that the Old English and German translators in following the Latin here closely were at the same time following strong native tendencies. There was early in the historic period a desire for a clearer expression for the partitive idea. The English "of" and German *von* graphically represent the separation of one or more from a group. This seems evident in case of *von*, but it is also true of "of," for it had in Old English the force of "from." Indeed, we sometimes find "from" where we now use "of." Since the Old English period, "of" has lost much of its old graphic force.

It is becoming more and more to be a mere colorless adnominal form with the force of the older colorless synthetic genitive. This was, however, in earlier periods quite different.

This new partitive genitive was not only used in adnominal function, but was also often employed with verbs instead of the old simple partitive genitive: "jabai hwas matjip *his hlaibis*" (Wulfila, John 6:51), "swa hwa swa ytt of *dyson hlafe*" (Corpus), "if any man eat of *this bread*"; "ni sijup *lambe meinaize*" (John 10:26), "ge ne synt of *minum sceapum*," "Ye are not of *my sheep*." The German developed here in exactly the same way: "gebet uns fon *iuuueremo ole*" (Tatian, 148.5), "Give us of *your oil*"; "ir ni birut fon *minen scafon*" (*ibid.*, 134.3), "ye are not of *my sheep*."

This common genitive construction developed later quite differently in German and English. In order that the later development may become perfectly clear the origin of the construction is here given in brief with the entire subsequent development in both languages.

The freedom of position in case of the word denoting the whole so often found in partitive constructions in both English and German seems to indicate that it was originally not an attributive genitive modifying the noun denoting the part of the quantity, but was a modifier of the verb: "Des Brotes [partitive object] isst er, einen Bissen" (explanatory addition), or with different word-order: "Er isst des Brotes, einen Bissen." In time a close relation developed between the two nouns, so that the genitive was felt as belonging to the following noun rather than to the verb: "Thiu faz thiū namun lides zuei odo thriu mez" (Otfrid, 2. 9. 95), "The vessels contained two or three measures of wine." The punctuation here indicates that the genitive *lides* modifies the noun *mez*, but in such a delicate question as this we cannot rely on the punctuation of a printed text or even the manuscript itself. The punctuation may in fact represent the true state of things, but it is also possible that *lides* here is the partitive object of the verb and that "zuei odo thriu mez" is an explanatory addition. The next step in the development made the situation perfectly clear. In those cases where the genitive was felt as belonging to the noun a change in the word-order developed. The genitive instead of preceding the governing noun followed it in accordance with the general tendency elsewhere to place the genitive

after the governing noun: "Er isst einen Bissen des Brotes." English examples are not given, as they correspond in the older period exactly to the German ones just given. Later English usage varies only in that the older synthetic genitive was replaced by the new synthetic form with "of": "He is eating a piece *of the bread*."

Alongside this German and English form of statement there is another which represents a different development. The original form "Er isst des Brotes, einen Bissen" could be replaced by "Er isst Brot, einen Bissen," as the partitive object could be replaced by an accusative object. This is not a modern form but like the genitive construction is very old: "usnemun laibos gabruko sibun spwreidans" (Wulfila, Mark 8:8), "hi namon pæt of pam brytsenum belaf, seofon wilian fulle" (Corpus), "they took up of the broken meat that was left seven baskets" (King James Version), "We sceolon ealle pa ping pe us gesceotap of ures geares teolunge Gode pa teopunge syllan" (Sweet, *Selected Homilies of Aelfric*, p. 48), "We should give to God the tenth part of all the things which accrue to us from our year's work." In the King James Version we have the partitive construction, in Wulfila, Aelfric, and Corpus the appositional construction. Wulfila has followed the Greek here. This appositional construction is also found in colloquial Latin and in careless, easy style in general. It is of course also found later in English and German. "I yow foryeve this trespass every del" (Chaucer's "Knight's Tale," 969). "But there is gold and silver gret plentee" (Mandeville). "Silver and Gold have I none" (Acts 3:6). "Aber Geld sieht man keins" (Karl Schönherr, *Sonnewendtag*, p. 9). "Schmerz empfand ich keinen" (Isolde Kurz, *Nachbar Werner*). It is much more common in modern German than in English. The writer gives a long list of examples from recent German literature in his *Grammar of the German Language*, p. 515, and has since found many additional examples, which show that this construction is a conspicuous feature of colloquial speech in the German of today.

Especial attention is here called to the two forms, the usual literary form with the genitive and the colloquial form with the appositional construction, for the former has become fixed in English and the latter in German. The word-order in the appositional

construction, however, now more commonly follows the analogy of the word-order in the genitive form. Thus after the analogy of "Er isst einen Bissen des Brotes" the appositional form often becomes: "Er isst einen Bissen Brot." This appositional construction has in recent German almost entirely replaced here the genitive form, as the modern genitive has often no distinctive ending and the genitive construction has become confounded with the appositional construction: "Er trank ein *Glas Milch*" (perhaps genitive, but in form an appositive to *Glas*); "Er kaufte ein Paar *Schuhe*" (perhaps genitive plural, but in form an appositive to *Paar*). There is in modern English no construction exactly like this. A seemingly similar construction is found in "a dozen eggs," "much good," "a little good," "something good," "nothing good," "anything good," etc. In older English the substantive form was in the partitive genitive: "nan ping *yfeles*" (*Twelfth Century Homilies*, p. 138). A little later the synthetic genitive here ought to have been replaced by the analytic form as was the common usage outside of this little group, and this new form indeed occasionally appeared: "Of Nazareth may sum thing *of good be*?" (Wyclif, John 1:46, Pickering's ed.). The partitive genitive later disappeared as the preceding words "a dozen," "much," "a little," etc., had come to be felt as mere limiting adjectives. Hence the substantive was no longer felt as a modifier but as an independent noun.

The real appositional construction, however, as found in modern German was also employed in older English: "no morsel *bred*" (Chaucer's "The Monkes Tale," 444), "pre *pe noblest ryueres* of al Europe" (Trevisa, Higden's "Polychronicon," l. 199, about 1387 A.D.), etc. This construction has entirely disappeared without leaving a single trace behind and the question of the cause of this disappearance naturally arises. This construction was in Old English a favorite in colloquial speech and was felt as a distinct construction. In the early Middle English period after the destruction of the older declensions an occasional indistinct trace of the older synthetic partitive genitive survived. Such defective and often ambiguous synthetic forms were finally entirely replaced by the clear analytic form. There was no strong literature which, with the natural conservatism of standard speech, held the people to their



older synthetic genitive. Only dialectic influences prevailed and all the native tendencies were toward the clear analytic form. Thus every trace of the old synthetic partitive genitive disappeared. The old colloquial appositive continued a little longer than the indistinct synthetic forms, for it was in fact quite a different construction and some feeling for it was left. Still later it was felt as the last remnant of these old defective synthetic genitives and was replaced by the clear analytic genitive.

Thus in fact the English development is the opposite of the German. In English the appositional construction was confounded with the genitive construction, while in German the genitive was confounded with the appositional form. German, on the other hand, developed as above described because there were no serious ambiguities of form which made imperative the use of *von*. All the tendencies in the literary language were in the direction of the retention and the steady use of the synthetic genitive. The modern use of *von* in the partitive category rests, in general, upon the same basis as in the ninth century. It is employed only to emphasize the idea of separation: "Geben Sie mir ein Stück vom Braten" emphasizes the idea of separation which is about to take place, while the appositional construction, "Das Kind hielt ein Stück Braten in der Hand," contains the partitive idea without the idea of separation. There is here a double form and there is always a tendency to differentiate forms. It is possible that the so-called appositional construction here is dimly felt as a reduced form of the old synthetic form so that the new analytic and the old synthetic forms stand in contrast to each other. The former emphasizes the idea of separation, the latter contains the usual partitive idea as found in the synthetic partitive genitive. Differentiation cannot usually take place here in English, as we usually have only one form. The analytic form has not now its original idea of separation as it has been pressed into service as a substitute for the older ambiguous discarded synthetic genitive. Hence without differentiation in form we say: "Give me a piece of the roast meat," and "The child held a piece of roast meat in its hand," using "of" in both cases.

The new analytic partitive genitive plays an important rôle in the development and spread of the new form. The origin of the

old synthetic genitive is wrapped in complete darkness, but the principal source of the development of the new analytic form is in the new partitive genitive with "of" and *von*, which had already in the ninth century developed considerable force. Other genitive categories closely related to the partitive genitive laid aside their old historic form and assumed the new form employed in the partitive category. We shall now take up these different categories one by one.

Very closely related to the partitive genitive is the genitive of material or composition: "and wundon cyne-helm *of þornum*" (Corpus, Matt. 27:29), "and when they had platted a crown of thorns" (King James Version), "plectentes coronam de spinis." We are here at the very source of the attributive construction. We cannot tell whether *of þornum* is an adverbial element modifying the verb or whether it is an attributive modifier of the noun *cyne-helm*. Even in the King James Version the distinction has not yet become clear. Today we can distinguish the adverbial element by using "out of" instead of simple "of": "they made a crown out of thorns." Thus the "of" in the Old English was originally employed in the sense of "out of" and even in attributive function retained for centuries its full original force. Indeed, it must have been difficult at first to distinguish attributive and adverbial functions. In the translation of these same Latin words the glossarist of the Lindisfarne MS (about 950 A.D.) in John 19:2 seems to have tried to differentiate them: "ða ðegnas gewundun *of ðornum* ða corna, or þæt sigbeg *of ðornum*." In the first use of *of ðornum* we have beyond doubt the adverbial function, in the second it seems as though the glossarist intended the attributive use, as he puts it after the noun. It seems as though he were not entirely sure whether *de spinis* was an adverbial or an adnominal element and hence gave both translations. We have a clear case of adnominal use in the Corpus Version: "se iohannes hæfde reaf *of* olfenda hærum" (Matt. 3:4), "John had raiment of camel's hair," "ipse iohannes habebat uestimentum de pilis camelorum." The Latin model has not been given because the writer thinks that the English has been influenced by it. The Corpus Version is characterized by great simplicity and independence. The development in English here runs parallel with the Latin. The analytic form is also found here in the Lindisfarne and

Rushworth MSS. It is quite probable that the analytic genitive of material was common in the plain prose of the late Old English period, for Mr. George Shipley in his *Genitive Case in Anglo-Saxon Poetry*, p. 89, gives an older example from poetry, which in general is quite conservative with regard to the use of new forms: "þære burge weard | anne manlican ofer metodes est, | gylde of golde, gumum arærde" ("Daniel," 175, eighth century), "the lord of the city set up for the people against the Creator's will an image, an idol of gold." In German we find a case in the ninth century: "flehtente corona fon thornon" (Tatian, 200:2). We find here the same ambiguity as in the first English examples given above. The later spread of the analytic form is due in both English and German to the vivid force of "of," not to the loss of the declensions. Of course the loss of inflection facilitated the development in English. In 1200 A.D. the triumph of the English analytic form is almost complete. In German the old synthetic genitive persisted throughout the Middle High German period and in figurative language is even still found: "Die Sonne versinkt hinter einer Wehr *weisser Berge* im Westen" (Ernst Zahn). Also in the broad sense of composition: "ein Schwarm Heuschrecken," "eine Reihe blühender Kinder." In spite of full inflectional forms, however, the analytic form has elsewhere by reason of the graphic force of *von* gained a complete victory: "ein Ring von Gold," etc. On the other hand, in compounds the oldest form, i.e., the synthetic genitive in the position before the noun, is still well preserved: "Dornenkrone," "Blumenkranz," etc.

The possessive genitive is in the new development closely related to the partitive idea as clearly seen in the following examples: "pæt gemong ðara wyrta of tuæm treum receles" (*Lindisfarne Glosses*, John 19:39, about 950 A.D.), "the mixture made from the leaves of two fragrant trees." "pæt he þe ðone ele syllan sceolde of þam treowe ðære myldheortnyse" ("The Harrowing of Hell," eleventh century, Bright, *Anglo-Saxon Reader*, p. 130), "that he should give thee the oil of the tree of mercy." In the first example the leaves belong to the tree but here they are represented as having been taken from the trees. The same is true of the oil in the second example. Here, perhaps, the idea of *separation* is stronger than

the idea of *possession*. In the following example the idea of separation is entirely absent and the idea of possession alone remains: "Ne for-wyrð a locc of *cowrum heafde*" (Corpus, Luke 21:18), "But there shall not a hair of your head perish." A single hair is a part of the head, it also belongs to the head. In still earlier periods the idea of possession ruled here supremely. From late Old English on the imagery of the language changed a little. For the expression of the conception of belonging to something as an integral part or an essential element the old synthetic genitive was discarded and the preposition "of" was employed, which retained in large measure its old original partitive idea, but with a new application of its force. Thus we read in the *Saxon Chronicle* for the year 992 E of the "Abb (ud) of Burch," "the abbot of Burch," for the year 1066 D of "Harold cyng of Eoferwic," "Harold king of York," "Harold cyng of Norwegan," etc. For this same year, however, in MS E we find the older synthetic genitive with the older conception of personal ownership: "Harold se *Norrena* cyng." The old synthetic form is still employed in warm poetic language, but by reason of the lack of a clear genitive form for the plural we today use the singular: "England's king," "Albion's queen," etc. The new analytic form also occurs in the German Otfrid: "ther keisor *fona rumu*" (1. 11. 2). As in this last example the analytic genitive is still used in German in formal titles, as in "der Kaiser von Deutschland," but in warm poetic language we can say: "Deutschland's Kaiser" (indicating pride in ownership). The analytic form is also employed in case of names of places ending in a sibilant: "die Strassen von Paris," but "die Strassen Berlins." Here the use of *von* is a mere matter of form. The *s* of the genitive ending in words ending in a sibilant is lost in the preceding *s* and the form is not felt as a clear genitive ending. Instead of the synthetic genitive we find the appositional construction where the possessive idea disappears: "das Porträt W. Zimmermann," "the portrait of [representing] W. Zimmermann," "der Antrag Rümelin," "the motion made by Rümelin," etc. In general, however, the old synthetic form is remarkably well preserved in German in the possessive category. In English on the contrary it has almost entirely disappeared in case of nouns representing things.

Why in the possessive category is the analytic genitive so much more used in English than in German? There are two chief factors which favored in English the spread of the analytic form, the graphic force of the preposition "of" with its clear idea of separation, source, or integral part, and, on the other hand, the lack of clear genitive forms in the later period of the decay of the old declensions. Let us first study the first factor. There was already in the Old English period a distinct feeling for the graphic force of "of" in the possessive category. It emphasized the idea of source more than the colorless synthetic genitive. Although the synthetic form was usually employed with nouns representing persons, "of" was sometimes even there preferred that the idea of source might become prominent: "he gesceop ealle gesceafta purh pone Sune sepe wæs æfre of him acenned wisdom of pam wisan Fæder" (Aelfric, *Preface to Genesis*, tenth century), "He [i.e., God] created all creatures through His Son, who born of Him and always with Him was the wisdom of the wise Father." This is a beautiful use of "of." It is still vividly felt when we say: "he walks in the strength of God." The picture becomes quite different when we say: "he walks in God's strength." This emphasis upon possession robs man of his dignity, of his independence. The full force and beauty of "of" is nicely brought out in: "fortitudo pat is, strengþe of gode" (*Vices and Virtues*, p. 81, about 1200 A.D.). The use of the synthetic genitive would entirely destroy the sense. Thus it becomes perfectly clear that although "of" is usually employed with nouns representing things it also often becomes necessary with nouns denoting persons when the idea of source becomes more prominent than the possessive idea. This was never true of German in the same measure as in English. This tendency is old in English. It arose at a period when the declensions were intact. Thus it is a question of feeling, not a mere question of form.

The natural fondness for the expressive "of" led to its use in different shades of the original meaning with different applications of its force: "bituih medo gemæro of decapol" (Mark 7:31, Lindisfarne MS, about 950 A.D.), "through the boundaries of Decapolis." The glossarist uses the analytic form with "of" although the Latin text over which he wrote the English words has the synthetic genitive

*decapoleos*. The "of" here has a force quite different from its original meaning. There is no idea of separation. It has the derived meaning of belonging to something as an integral part of it. The idea of an *integral* part is, however, rather faint. The force of "of" has here become almost as colorless as the older synthetic genitive, which we find in this same expression in the ninth century: "eal *Breotene* gemæro" (Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, p. 338), "all the boundaries of Britain." The use of "of" here in the Lindisfarne MS seems to indicate a previous usage so long and steady that the original coloring had worn off considerably, and yet the new conception of integral part was felt vividly enough to be preferred to the older conception of possession. Even if the glossarist employed the analytic form to avoid the addition of an *s* to a sibilant, it remains true that the form was felt as a genitive. The glossarist might have retained the foreign genitive as he does elsewhere and as the translator of the Corpus Version has done in this same passage. He preferred, however, the analytic form just as we do today. The idea is removed a little too far from that of personal possession for the use of the synthetic form. Modern Swedish, which has much wider boundaries in the possessive idea than English, preserves the synthetic form here even though the noun ends in a sibilant: "midit igenom Dekapolis' gränsland." The Rushworth glossarist followed the example of the Lindisfarne glossarist and wrote: "bitwih middum gimærum of decapolem." The Latin of the Rushworth text has the appositional construction with the non-inflection of the proper name: "medio finis decapolis." Thus also the Rushworth glossarist translated independently of his Latin model. Also in another passage in the Lindisfarne text, John 19:39 quoted above, the English glossarist employs the analytic genitive independently of the Latin text. Thus we are forced to the conclusion that "of" had in northern English already attained wider boundaries than a careless reading of this text might suggest. This is confirmed by the remarkable fact that in this extensive translation consisting of the Four Gospels the translator or translators have never once failed to translate an analytic genitive by the corresponding English analytic form. The two forms *de* and *ex* are used in the Latin, but the English glossarist almost uniformly uses "of." Only occasionally does he employ



"from": "hwa is *from* iuh" (Matt. 7:9), "hwylc man is *of* eow" (Corpus), "what man is there *of* you" (King James Version). Usually "from" is employed with adverbial elements as in present usage. The "of" has begun to lose its original force and has developed perceptibly in the direction of becoming a mere substitute for the old synthetic genitive. This process has gone farther in the Lindisfarne MS than in the Corpus text: "hwa awæltas us ðone stan *from* duro ðæs byrgennes?" (Lindisfarne, Mark 16:3), "hwa awylt us ðysne stan *of* pære byrgene dura?" (Corpus), "who shall roll us away the stone *from* the door of the sepulcher?" (King James Version). Thus in the English Corpus text "of" is still used adverbially, and this usage continued for a long time. In the Lindisfarne text, on the other hand, "from" is occasionally used in adnominal genitive constructions, but "of" prevails in general, and the usage of today is already clearly foreshadowed. In German this differentiation between "of" and "from" was absolutely unknown, so that at this point the two languages from now on developed in different directions. In the Lindisfarne MS over against the many adnominal *de*'s and *ex*'s of the Latin text is the almost uniform "of" in the English glosses, a clear indication of the almost complete crystallization of the usage so familiar to us today. The firmness of this northern usage becomes apparent when we observe that the glossarist does not once put a second form, a synthetic genitive, alongside the "of," for it is his common practice to give *two* or *three* translations in cases where he is not quite sure whether he has rendered the word idiomatically. He often gives a close translation and then gives a freer, more idiomatic rendering. He is uniformly contented to translate the analytic genitive *de* or *ex* by the analytic "of," for it corresponds to the common usage of his dialect.

The use of "of" as a mere substitute for the synthetic genitive is found not only in northern English but also in the literary language of the South: "sum seoc man wæs genemned lazarus *of* bethania *of* marian cæstre and *of* martham his swustra" (Corpus, John 11:1), "Now a certain man was sick, named Lazarus, *of* Bethany, the town of Mary and her sister Martha" (King James Version). The word-order here is very interesting. In the King James Version we have the modern order as found when we use "of." In the Corpus

text we have the older order as found when we use the synthetic form, as in "John's hat and William's." We often find this order in the Corpus text: "iocobes broðor and Iosepes" (Mark 6:3). In the passage from John 11:1 the author of the Corpus text used a synthetic genitive in the first instance and the new analytic genitive in the second instance, which in literal translation would now read "Bethany, *Mary's* home town and also that *of Martha*, his sisters." In modern English we must insert here the determinative "that." We do not now use the mixed form much, but it occasionally occurs. It is hard to account for the analytic form here in the Corpus text on the basis of the *meaning*. The "of," as in the Lindisfarne example quoted in the preceding paragraph, has entirely lost its original meaning. It is evidently used as a mere substitute for the synthetic genitive.

The author of the Corpus text does what we told above of the author of the *Lindisfarne Glosses*—he employs the analytic genitive where his Latin model has a synthetic form: "ne eom ic asend buton to pam sceapum pe forwurdon *of israēla huse*" (Matt. 15:24), "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep *of the house of Israel*" (King James Version). The Latin text of the Lindisfarne MS has the synthetic form here: "*domus israel*." The same Latin reading is found in the Rushworth MS, also in Tatian. We do not know whether the Latin text used by the Corpus translator was different from the other texts. In general, however, this translator proceeds quite independently of the Latin text. He often uses the analytic genitive, often the old synthetic form without regard to the Latin model. He is familiar with both forms and uses both freely. This is true not only of the possessive category of which we are talking, but also of the other genitive categories. This translator was writing in a literary language with firm transitions fixed by centuries of usage. He naturally departed from tradition only under strong pressure, for he was undoubtedly a man of culture and refinement and had the conservative regard for literary models that naturally accompanies culture and education. A learned man lives not only in the present but also in the past. Not only his thought but also his language is connected with the past. It must have been a really strong pressure that could lead a learned man to lay aside the established *grammar* of his

language. This strong pressure in the present instance was the strong tendency that undoubtedly existed in spoken English toward the use of the analytic genitive. If "of" is used a large number of times in this translation it was surely used much more in natural spoken language. When this literary language disappeared in the twelfth century and dialect took its place, in every part of England "of" appeared at once with the wide boundaries of usage that it has today. This usage had been developing for centuries in the spoken language. In the same way the instances of the use of the analytic genitive in the Late Latin were only a faint indication of the strength that the new development had acquired in popular usage. We now turn to the consideration of the possessive genitive in the later period to study the formal factors involved in the development of the analytic genitive.

We have seen in the preceding paragraphs that there was a natural inclination toward the use of the analytic genitive with "of" on account of a widespread fondness for the vivid force of its meaning over against the colorless synthetic genitive. The development of the new form was further favored by a mere formal force—the decay of the old declensions and the resulting ambiguity on account of the lack of distinctive endings. This disintegration began in the North. It can be noticed in the *Lindisfarne Glosses*: "sunu ðe monnes" (Luke 17:30), "the Son of man." The article *ðe* has lost its inflection here. Also the declensions of nouns and adjectives in this same manuscript show abundant signs of approaching disintegration. Later in all parts of England the old declensions of nouns and adjectives were quite thoroughly destroyed by a natural process of development. Doubtless the Norman-French invasion hastened this process, because it led to the neglect of the literary language. A rich, live literature always has a conserving power. The loss of inflection here completed the work of the destruction of the synthetic genitive. The form was beginning to lose its popularity on account of its colorless meaning; now it became impossible on account of the loss of the different declensions. There was nothing left to distinguish the singular from the plural. The genitive singular and plural now ended in *s*. If we did not have the analytic genitive we should have to say: The branches the trees, the marbles the boys,

the fingers the hands, the legs the chairs, the eyes the girls, the grass the fields, the sides the mountains, the soil the valleys, etc. There is here no sense at all, it is all pure nonsense. It is not the English language, it is no language at all; for the most elementary language of the crudest people means something, but these words mean nothing. Someone might thoughtlessly reply that these are only a few well-chosen examples, but the writer replies that there are many thousands of examples just as good. It was, moreover, not only the absolute danger of ambiguity that militated against the use of the old synthetic form in this reduced state of the inflectional systems. The rudest suggestion sometimes conveys an idea with perfect accuracy. A mere fragment of a sentence reveals often the entire thought. The normal thought of a people, however, usually demands a clear grammatical expression. The mind is as much disturbed by slovenly conditions of speech as our bodily feeling is sensible to slovenly conditions around us. It demands imperatively law and order. In the words "chiueringe of toðen" (*Vices and Virtues*, p. 19, about 1200 A.D.), "the gnashing of teeth," the "of" was inserted because the grammatical relations of the old synthetic genitive *toðen* was not clearly expressed. The case might possibly be nominative, genitive, dative, or accusative. The connection suggested the genitive, but the feeling of the author demanded a clear and orderly expression and hence he inserted "of." In the same way a German says: "Blätter von Blumen" to avoid the slovenly expression "Blätter Blumen." Such language would sound more like baby talk than intelligent speech.

There is a remarkable law here which defines accurately just what constitutes slovenly speech. Any deficiency of form however slight is considered unpardonable slovenliness if the form follows the governing noun, while the same deficiency is regarded as perfectly satisfactory if the form stands before the noun. This law can best be studied in the English of the twelfth century. At this time a few adjective forms occasionally retained the older inflection. In this case the older synthetic genitive was retained even where it followed the noun: "seinte poul hegest alre lorpew" (*Old English Homilies*, Series 2, p. 153), "St. Paul, the greatest of all teachers." It should be noticed here that the genitive is not a possessive genitive

but a partitive and hence one that would naturally incline to the new analytic form, but the clear genitive form *alre* made the synthetic form possible even at this late date. It should also be noticed that the genitive *lorþew* is not a clear genitive, as it is exactly like the singular. It expresses neither the case nor the number clearly, but it did not give offense here, as the preceding adjective expressed number and case clearly. The same thing is found in modern German: "Der Vater des jungen Goethe." Here *Goethe* has no ending at all, but it is not felt as imperfect as the preceding article expresses the genitive relation clearly. Now it should be noticed that these inflected adjective forms are in direct contact with the preceding noun. This explains the fact that the genitive that precedes the governing noun does not give offense, even though the preceding adjectives are not inflected. The genitive of the noun usually has a clear genitive form and this genitive is in direct contact with the following governing noun: "*þis childe* witige gost" (*ibid.*, p. 127), "this child's prophetic spirit." Here *þis* is uninflected but *childe* has a clear genitive form and is in direct contact with the governing noun and its modifiers. Thus inflection was demanded only at the point where the two components of the adnominal group touched each other. This law the writer names "the law of immediate contact" for the want of a better term. The law is so simple that it must have been noticed by others, but the writer has not been able to find any record of it in his studies. This simple law explains the entire development in English. The danger of ambiguity in many places must have facilitated this development but the law itself has nothing to do with ambiguity. Swedish has much fuller synthetic forms than English and thus the danger of ambiguity was not as great, but the development there as in English was *entirely* controlled by the law of immediate contact. Thus after the loss of the inflection of the article and of adjectives the synthetic form entirely disappeared in English and Swedish wherever it followed the governing noun.

Thus the study of this development does not point to French influence. The English language had developed the analytic form centuries before the Norman French came in. It was used at first for its vivid force. When the different declensions were destroyed, the analytic form already in a flourishing state of development simply

replaced it. The development was so natural and inevitable that the writer rejects in his own thought the suggestion of the faintest influence from the French. Swedish, far removed from French influences, has had a similar development. The only difference in the development in the two languages is the stronger life of the analytic form in English. This is amply accounted for by the strong inclination to the analytic form which was already manifest in the literary language of the Old English period and by the later destruction of this literary language. The conserving power of the literary standard form of speech was eliminated and the language entirely given over to the dialects that in still greater measure favored the analytic genitive. We can see very plainly in modern German how the dialects favor the analytic form.

The word-order is an important element in the study of the possessive genitive. The old synthetic genitive is preserved wherever it precedes the governing noun: "John's father," "the boy's father," "the emperor of Germany's father," "death's grip," "the sun's rays," "the earth's axis," "the planet's orbit," "hell's fire," "the World's Fair," "the jury's verdict," "a stone's throw," "a day's journey," "a quarter of an hour's ride," "a boat's length," "at a moment's notice," "the next day's supply," "the ship's crew," "my journey's end," "for goodness' sake," "for conscience' sake," "good for good's sake," "at his wits' end," "to his heart's content," "out of harm's way," "yesterday's mail," and many others. The list was once larger: "at his *beddes* heed" (Chaucer's "Prolog," 293), "unto our *lyues* ende" (*ibid.*, "The Shipman's Tale," 434), etc. This usage is, in general, limited to the singular, as the plural form does not differ from the singular and could not in most cases be recognized as such. We say "the children's hats," "the women's hats," "men's clothing," but "the hats of the girls," etc.

It is a remarkable fact that the synthetic genitive has not been preserved in a single instance where it formerly stood after its governing noun. The ambiguity of the form here or the slovenliness of the form by reason of the lack of clear case forms to indicate in an orderly way the grammatical relations, as illustrated above, usually made its use impossible. It might have been used in the few cases where the noun had a different genitive form in the singular and plural



as "woman's" and "women's," "man's" and "men's," "child's" and "children's," but these words almost uniformly stood *before* the governing noun. On the other hand, in the cases where these words or others stood after the governing noun the old synthetic genitive was impossible by the operation of the law of immediate contact explained above, for the preceding article was uninflected. Moreover, there was a strong tendency to the use of "of" on account of its meaning. Thus the two most powerful factors, form and meaning, conspired here to destroy the synthetic genitive wherever it followed the noun. It was purely native forces that brought about the loss of this form. The English-speaking people no longer had a choice here between the synthetic and analytic forms as in the period of richer inflection. They were forced to discard entirely the older genitive. The only way to prove French influence here would be to show that French has influenced English where the genitive stood *before* the noun, i.e., in the possessive category in the narrow sense, i.e., literal personal possession. This is, however, the only place where the old synthetic genitive has been preserved in its full extent. Thus it is quite clear that the loss or preservation of the synthetic form was solely a question of its position and its position was a question of its meaning. We turn now to a study of these two factors.

In oldest Germanic the genitive could stand either before or after its governing noun, but it preferred the position before it. The same is true of adjectives. Gradually the adjective began to abandon the position after the noun and became ever more and more fixed in the position before the noun. In the same measure the genitive began to abandon the position before the noun and became established after the noun. The process went on steadily in both English and German for centuries. Only one class of genitives remained fixed before the noun, the possessive genitive in the narrow sense of personal possession. The only explanation for this remarkable exception that presents itself to the writer is the close relation in meaning between the possessive genitive and the possessive adjective or pronoun. Thus "*his* book" might have influenced "John's book." It seems a little easier to account for the gradual movement of the other genitives to the position after the noun. With advancing

culture language loses its simplicity of structure. The sentences become more involved in intricate hypotactical formations. The genitive becomes loaded with modifiers of different kinds, other genitives, relative clauses, etc. It often became necessary to place the genitive with its modifiers after the governing noun. At the same time it often became desirable or even necessary to put the adjective modifiers before the governing noun. Neither in case of adjectives nor of genitives, however, was this change of position in every case a mere matter of convenience in the arrangement of words. There were psychological factors at work. There was a tendency for adjectives, especially pronominals, as "this," "that," "such," etc., to seek a position before the subject to establish a closer connection with what preceded. In case of genitives, as we have seen, the meaning of the genitive categories had considerable influence.

In oldest English a genitive of any kind whatever preceded the governing noun if it had the natural sentence accent: "No his lif-gedal | sárlíc puhte *sécg*a ænegum, | para-pe," etc. (*Beowulf*, 841-42), "His deth did not seem grievous to any of the *men* who," etc. The measure shows clearly that *sécg*a is stressed. Hence it precedes its governing word although it is a partitive genitive which in later English preferred the position after the governing word. Of course, a possessive genitive can also stand before its governing word if it has the sentence accent: "Únferð maðelode *Écgla*fes bearn" (*Beowulf*, 499), "Únferth the son of *Écgla*f spoke." The situation changed materially before the end of the Old English period. The genitive that precedes the governing noun is often unaccented: "gif ge *ábra*hames bearn synt wyrceað *abra*hames *wéorc*" (Corpus, John 8:39), "if you were *Ábra*ham's children ye would do the *wórks* of Abraham." We have no poetic measure here with its well-known accents to guide us, but it seems quite probable that the first *abra*hames is accented, while the second one is without sentence stress. The stress falls upon *wéorc*. The sentence stress has nothing to do with the position as in oldest English. Other considerations which have been mentioned in the preceding paragraph now control the word-order. The word *abra*hames in both cases precedes the governing word because it denotes possession. The more pronounced the idea of personal possession is, the more natural it is to put the genitive

before the noun. The more indistinct this idea becomes, the more natural it is to put the genitive after the noun. Of course, the genitive that followed the noun later assumed the analytic form as explained above. Hence in the translation of this last example the authors of the King James Version used "Abraham's" in the first instance but "of Abraham" in the second instance, as the first case seemed a possessive genitive while the second seemed more a genitive of characteristic. Wyclif's translation of this passage reads: "if ȝe ben the sones of Abraham do ȝe werkis of Abraham." The syntax of this fourteenth-century translation is here nearer that of our own time than that of the King James Version. These Jews were not the sons of Abraham in the literal sense; they had, however, descended from him. Hence the "of" of the analytic genitive expresses this idea better. Thus we should more naturally say: "if you were the genuine disciples of Christ you would be more like him" than: "if you were Christ's genuine disciples." This latter expression seems to us to apply rather to the historic company of twelve. We do not say "the hat of John," because we feel the "of" as meaningless, but we may say either "by the grace of God" or "by God's grace" according to the meaning. We incline, however, more naturally to the use of "by the grace of God," for we do not think so much of the idea of *possession* as we do of the idea of the *source* of the manifold mercies that come to us.

We may see the difference between the synthetic genitive of possession and the analytic genitive with "of," but it may be a little more difficult to see how this differentiation in large measure corresponds to the older distinction of placing the synthetic possessive genitive *before* the noun and the same synthetic genitive *after* the noun to indicate the other genitive categories. The facts of the German and English languages, however, point clearly to this differentiation. The exact boundaries of the idea of possession vary very much. A few examples are here given to show what wide boundaries this idea still had about 1000 A.D. in English: "topa gristbitung" (Corpus, Matt. 8:12), "gnashing of teeth," subjective genitive; "uppan oliuetes dune" (*ibid.*, Matt. 26:30), "the Mount of Olives," appositive genitive; "iudea cyning" (*ibid.*, Matt. 27:27), "King of the Jews," possessive genitive; "swina heord," "a herd of swine"

(*ibid.*, Matt. 8:30), genitive of composition, material, etc.; "mannes sunu" (*ibid.*, Matt. 8:20), "the son of man"; "pæs temples wahryft" (*ibid.*, Luke 23:45), "the veil of the temple"; "ðæs hælendes fet" (*ibid.*, John 12:3), "the feet of Jesus"; "godes weg" (*ibid.*, Matt. 22:16), "the way of God"; "of pæs wingearde wæstmne" (Luke 20:10), "of the fruit of the vineyard." These expressions show plainly that the idea of possession in 1000 A.D. is quite different from that which obtains today. As we do not know what the origin of the synthetic genitive was, we do not know whether we have the right to say that the idea of possession is the central thought in all these examples, but the fondness of these words for the position before the noun seems to indicate this. Many of them still maintain this position, as "a stone's throw," "a boat's length," "the sun's rays," etc. Older usage is especially tenacious in the parts of the body in connection with a noun indicating a living being: "the cat's eye," or "the eye of the cat," but "the eye of a pansy," "the eye of a needle." In the Corpus Version we find: "purh are nædle eage" (Luke 18:25), "A nedlis iȝe" (Purvey), "A needle's eye" (King James Version). The old conception is that of possession, the new one that of an integral part. The Old English expression "Mannes sunu" was also firmly fixed in English feeling. Wyclif and his reviser Purvey with their "Mannes sone" remain throughout their translation consistently true to the Old English. Later the idea of source displaced the older idea of possession as seen by the modern form "the son of man." The list of possessive genitives was greater in 1000 A.D., not only because the boundaries of the possessive idea were greater but also because the rich inflection of that period made it possible to use the genitive here freely in the plural: "wydywyna hus" (Luke 20:47), "the houses of widewes" (Purvey), "widows' houses" (King James Version). The fourteenth-century Purvey is closer to modern usage than the authors of the King James Version. Although we often follow the usage of the King James Version here and elsewhere in colloquial usage, we in general avoid the synthetic form here. The usage here in 1000 A.D. was not at all fixed except in case of geographical names, as "oliuetes dune," etc. The writer has not found a single instance where such genitives stood after the governing noun at this time. In all the other cases, however, these

genitives also followed the noun. Wherever in any case the possessive idea was not quite distinct they inclined to the position after the noun. The examples are countless and only a few need to be given to indicate the nature of the usage. In a very large number of cases the idea of possession yields to the conception of inherence: "pa micelan mihte his godecundnyssse" (Sweet, *Selected Homilies of Aelfric*, p. 48), "the great power of his divinity"; "pa deopnyssa pære lare" (*ibid.*, p. 54), "the depth of the teaching"; "pære nytennyssse his gecorenan Cupberhtes" (*ibid.*, p. 64), "the ignorance of his chosen follower Cuthbert." The idea of possession very often yields to the conception of source: "purh gife Hælendes Cristes" (*ibid.*, p. 31), "by the grace of our Savior Christ," but also with the possessive idea as in "purh Godes gife" (*ibid.*, p. 30), "by the grace of God." The idea of source is especially frequent in the subjective genitive: "purh mynegunge gelimplices lareowes" (*ibid.*, p. 64), "through the admonitions of a suitable teacher"; "purh gescyldnyssse sopes Drihtnes" (*ibid.*, p. 68), "by the protection of the true God." These two categories, inherence and source, are very much used. Their meanings, "contained in" and "coming from," are closely related to the meaning of the preposition "of." When the declensions lost their distinctive endings it was very easy to pass from these synthetic genitives denoting inherence and source to the analytic genitive with "of." Attention has already been called to the fact that the analytic possessive genitive that originated in the partitive idea was already at this time in actual use. It was naturally adapted for use also in these two large categories, for the "of" of the new analytic possessive genitive no longer contained the possessive idea pure and simple but ideas closely related to inherence and source.

Personal pronouns in the possessive genitive case have today a position different from that of nouns. In early Middle English, however, they sometimes had the same position as nouns. Whenever the possessive idea became indistinct and the idea of inherence, an integral part, or source became distinct they assumed the analytic form and followed the governing noun. "Wherefore I wole answere in this manere | by the leve of you" (Chaucer's "Merchant's Tale," ll. 949-50). The idea here is that of source. In case of a genitive

of a noun we would still employ Chaucer's order and say: "I did it with the permission of my father." We also have the idea of source in Chaucer's "Withouten help or grace of thee." In "whan that I considere your beautee | and ther-with-al the unlykly elde of me" (*ibid.*, ll. 935-6) the idea is that of inherence. We do not possess age. It inheres. In case of nouns we should still say: "The beauty of the granddaughter contrasted strongly with the unsightly age of the grandmother." In Middle English this analytic genitive of a pronoun is found after the noun even in plain prose: "the voicis of hem woxen stronge" (Purvey, Luke 23:23), "The voices of them and of the chief priests prevailed" (King James Version). Again we have the idea of inherence. "Not as the scribes of hem and the Farisees" (Purvey, Matt. 7:29). The Jews did not possess scribes. The scribes were an integral part of their system. This passage from Matthew reads in the Corpus Version: "ne swa hyre boceras and sundorhalgan." Here we have the old idea of possession. The next step would be to put the genitive *after* the noun, and this order we find in the *Lindisfarne Glosses*: "ne swæ uðuta hiora." We do not know whether the order here was the one found in actual speech, for the glossarist in this manuscript usually followed the word-order of the Latin original, as he simply wrote the English equivalent of every word over the Latin word. The change in the word-order of pronouns did not occur as early as the change in case of the nouns. The writer has not found in Old English a single synthetic genitive of a possessive pronoun *after* the governing noun except in the *Lindisfarne Glosses*. These Lindisfarne forms may not represent actual spoken speech, but it is possible that they do, for the language of the North often foreshadowed the later development of the South and Midland. The writer has found in German a few cases of the synthetic genitive of a personal pronoun standing after the noun: "Meine Mutter hatte meine Abwesenheit des Morgens beim Tee durch ein frühzeitiges Ausgehen *meiner* zu beschönigen gesucht" (Goethe, *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, Erster Teil, Fünftes Buch). If such forms actually existed in English the writer feels that he ought to have found some traces of them. He is inclined to the opinion that the analytic forms which stand after the governing noun as quoted above from Chaucer and Purvey arose from the analogy of the usage with



nouns and thus did not come from older synthetic genitives which had shifted their position to the place after the noun. As far as the writer can see, the Old English usage here continued without change through the transitional period up to the fourteenth century, when the pronouns began to follow the usage of nouns which had been constantly growing more common. The synthetic genitive found in the passage quoted above from Goethe originated in the same way: It followed the common usage in nouns. As the genitive of nouns with this shade of meaning followed the governing noun, the genitive of pronouns sometimes assumed the same position.

The usage of placing an analytic genitive of a personal pronoun after its governing noun has disappeared except in a few colloquial phrases: "for the life of me," as in "I couldn't for the life of *me* recall his name." "That will be the death of *you*." At one point, however, the analytic genitive of personal pronouns cannot be avoided and hence is in general use. In connection with pronouns, as "all," "both," "three," etc., a real personal pronoun must be used, and hence the analytic forms "of you," etc., must be employed, as there are no synthetic genitives of personal pronouns which are clearly felt as such: "*my* book and the books of *you all*" (or, "you both," "you three," etc.). The synthetic genitive of personal pronouns has been confounded with the possessive adjectives "my," "his," etc., which now serve not only as possessive adjectives but also as the possessive genitive of personal pronouns except in connection with the pronouns "all," "both," etc., where a real personal pronoun must be used and not an adjective. Thus in the example just given the possessive adjective "my" is used before "book," but in connection with "all" the analytic genitive "of you" is employed. The German also uses the possessive adjective in the first case, but employs the old synthetic genitive in the second: "mein Buch and Ihrer aller Bücher." About 1200 A.D. the English synthetic genitive was still in use here: "here beire friend" (*Vices and Virtues*, p. 81), "the friend of them both"; "ure alre heaued" (*ibid.*, p. 131), "the head of us all." Aside from this one special case of use with the pronouns "all," "both," "three," etc., it seems that there was once a chance of a fine differentiation between the possessive adjectives and the analytic genitive of the personal pronouns. By the disappearance

of the analytic genitive we have lost a fine and beautiful shade of meaning. Why did it disappear? The writer feels inclined to answer: "Did it really disappear?" Was it ever a fixed part of the language? After the analogy of nouns, a number of attempts were made to extend this expressive usage to pronouns, but alongside the few examples of this new usage were countless examples of the use of the old possessive in the position before the noun. At first thought it seems strange that this stupid, colorless possessive adjective could ever completely triumph over the expressive analytic form that had elsewhere scored so many victories. As we shall see below, insuperable difficulties were in the way of the spread of the analytic form at this point.

Mr. Eugen Eienkel raises the question whether the use of the analytic genitive of the personal pronouns as described in the two preceding paragraphs is not of French origin. It seems at first probable, for the examples began to appear at the time when French influence was strongest. The more, however, we study the question the less probable it seems. It is a clear fact that the objective genitive of a noun has become firmly fixed in the position after the noun, as in "the capture of the city," etc. It was only a natural result that the objective genitive of pronouns should assume this same position: "It will be the ruination of *you*." The development was a natural one, but it did not become strong. The old position before the noun is still more common: "my defeat," "his overthrow," "his ruin," "to my utter consternation," "it ended in our complete humiliation," "my bodily injuries," "his promotion to a higher grade," "his reduction to a lower grade," etc. The position after the noun is only in free use where it is necessary to prevent ambiguity: "fear of us," "hatred of us," etc. Mr. Eienkel misunderstands the English development here where he in his *Streifzüge*, p. 85, thinks that the position of the genitive of the pronoun after the governing noun is natural in case of the objective genitive, while it is imitation of the French in case of the possessive genitive. The spirit of English is equally averse to the position of the objective genitive after the noun. Violations of the rule occur more commonly in case of the objective genitive for the simple reason that the position after the noun is sometimes absolutely required to make

the thought clear. Thus we must say: "The sight of her" to keep it distinct from "her sight." That this tendency developed only in case of absolute ambiguity, in spite of the fact that it had become almost a universal rule in case of nouns, indicates very clearly that there must have been some hindering force in case of pronouns.

The writer regards the new sentence accent as the hindering force here. Within the group made up of a noun and its modifiers the element that follows invariably receives in normal speech the sentence stress: "the little *bóy*," "the boy's *fáther*," "the book on the *table*," "the capture of the *city*," etc. Thus the objective genitive invariably receives the sentence stress wherever it follows. This is uniformly the rule in case of nouns. The objective genitive of a personal pronoun does not usually follow the noun because its weak stress would be in conflict with the general rules for sentence accent. Attempts have been made at different times to place the objective genitive of pronouns after the noun where it naturally belongs according to all grammatical rules, but the harsh conflict with the sentence melody has prevented this grammatically and psychologically natural tendency. Likewise in German we occasionally find a synthetic objective genitive of a personal pronoun after the noun: "aus Verachtung Euer" (Schiller); sometimes even in more recent literature: "die unglückliche Nachricht der Arretierung Deiner" (Johann G. Reuter to his son Fritz, November 4, 1833). Where this word-order is unavoidable, as in case of the example from Schiller, prose usage prefers here the analytic form as it is a little heavier and gives the light pronoun a little more weight: "aus Verachtung für Euch." In the example from Reuter the possessive would now be preferred: "die unglückliche Nachricht Deiner Arretierung [or better Verhaftung]." The objective genitive of the personal pronoun itself can often stand after the governing noun if an accented word follows that can bring the construction in harmony with the sentence melody: "Anbeter Deiner *selbst*" (Wildenbruch, *Die Quitzows*, Act III). Likewise in case of the *possessive* genitive of pronouns there was an especially strong tendency to place the genitive after the noun and use the analytic form for the sake of its vivid meaning of source and inherence. In case of nouns this tendency developed into a fixed rule. In case of pronouns this natural

tendency came into conflict with the sentence accent and did not develop strength except where as above described the lack of inflectional endings made it necessary. That great poets like Chaucer and Goethe followed this tendency also elsewhere simply shows that in the war between the contending forces the forces of meaning had in their struggle with rhythm a decided advantage in the earlier periods. In one common case where it is necessary to place the genitive after the noun because a relative clause follows, modern usage replaces the personal pronoun by a stressed demonstrative, which brings the expression in perfect harmony with the sentence accent: "not the speech of *them which* [now *those who*] are puffed up" (I Cor. 4:19). Other cases of older usage have been left undisturbed because an accented pronoun follows the unaccented personal pronoun which by its weight places the construction in harmony with the sentence accent: "your books and the books of *us all*." In the light of these facts it will become perfectly clear that present usage with regard to the position of the possessive genitive is the result of conflicting native forces and has not been at any point affected by foreign influences.

[To be continued]

GEORGE O. CURME

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

## STUDIES IN *PIERS THE PLOWMAN*

### 1. THE BURDEN OF PROOF: ANTECEDENT PROBABILITY AND TRADITION

Although it is now eight years since Mr. Manly first made public and offered for investigation his theory of the multiple authorship of *Piers the Plowman*, and although his theory has been the subject of a considerable amount of scholarly discussion, the progress that has been made toward a final solution of the problem is disappointingly small. A problem of such complexity and difficulty as this one is not, of course, to be solved except at the expense of much toilsome investigation and protracted discussion. But no fruitful discussion can be carried on unless the two parties to the controversy can find common ground to stand upon and clearcut issues to discuss. The common ground that has been lacking in the discussion of this problem is a clear understanding as to where the burden of proof lies. Jusserand, Chambers, and Mensendieck have (explicitly or implicitly) argued upon the assumption that the burden of proof rests upon those who advocate the theory of multiple authorship. Mensendieck says, in speaking of the differences between the texts, "In der Tat, wenn die Texte nicht unter einem Namen zusammengefasst wären, würde der Leser nicht vermuten, die Schöpfungen eines und desselben dichterischen Geistes vor sich zu haben."<sup>1</sup> This remarkable statement can mean only that there is a strong presumption in favor of the traditional theory, a presumption of such force as to nullify evidence that would (in the absence of such presumption) lead to a conclusion in favor of multiple authorship. If such a presumption exists, of course, the burden of proof rests upon the advocates of the new theory. They must prove their case, but the advocates of the old theory are not obliged to prove theirs. All that the advocates of single authorship need do is to show that Mr. Manly's arguments do not prove multiple authorship; when they have done that, their own theory is still firmly established and does not have to be proved.

<sup>1</sup> *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Literaturgeschichte*, XVIII, 11.

That this is essentially the attitude of Mr. Chambers is shown by the following sentences from his article, "The Authorship of *Piers Plowman*":

It is not argued that A, B, and C are the same man, but only that the arguments so far brought forward are insufficient to prove that they are not. And we have a right to demand strong proof, for there is strong evidence, both internal and external, for William, if not William Langland, having been the author of all three versions.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Jusserand says:

For *Piers Plowman*, we have what the manuscripts tell us in their titles, colophons, or marginal notes; what the author tells us himself in his verses; and what tradition has to say, being represented by one man at least whose testimony is of real weight. Without exception, all those titles, colophons, marginal notes, and testimonies agree in pointing to the succession of visions, forming, at first, 8 or 12, and lastly 23 passus, as being one work, having for its general title *Piers Plowman*, and written by one author.<sup>2</sup> . . . Unity of the work, condition of the MSS, allusions in the text or out of it, marginal notes, tradition concerning both work and author agree well together. From the first, the poem has been held to consist of a succession of visions forming one single poem, as the *Canterbury Tales*, composed of a succession of tales, are only one work; and to have been written by one single author, called William or Robert (in fact certainly William) Langland. An attempt has recently been made to upset all that has been accepted thereon up to now.<sup>3</sup>

If Chambers and Jusserand seem less explicit than Mensendieck in claiming an initial presumption in favor of the theory of single authorship, their logical position is perfectly clear from the construction of their articles, which consist almost entirely of rebuttal of the arguments of Manly and Bradley.<sup>4</sup> They do not undertake to prove the theory of single authorship, but only to refute the arguments that have been made against it.

If the logical position of Jusserand, Chambers, and Mensendieck is correct, if there is such a strong initial presumption in favor of the theory of single authorship as places the burden of proof upon those who attack that theory, it ought not to be very difficult to show that

<sup>1</sup> *Modern Language Review*, V, 29.

<sup>2</sup> *Modern Philology*, VI, 277, 278.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, VI, 281.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Chambers' article cited above and his article in *Modern Language Review*, VI, 302 ff., consist almost entirely of rebuttal; Mr. Jusserand's two articles in *Modern Philology* (VI, 271 ff., and VII, 289 ff.) contain a number of arguments in favor of unity of authorship. But these arguments are not developed; they are merely stated, suggested, or implied. The great bulk of these two articles consists of refutation of Mr. Manly's details of proof.



this is the case. This is a fundamental matter upon which there must be mutual agreement, or there can be no fruitful discussion of the problem at all. If the burden of proof is upon the advocates of multiple authorship, they must accept the burden and argue their case accordingly. If the burden of proof is upon the advocates of single authorship as well as upon their opponents, those who disagree with Mr. Manly must cease to content themselves with a mere rebuttal of his arguments, and must construct in favor of the theory of single authorship an independent argument that will prove their case. They must furnish proof of their position of the same validity as they are now demanding of him for his.<sup>1</sup>

The presumption that has been claimed in favor of the traditional theory must rest upon some or all of the following grounds: (1) antecedent probability, (2) "tradition," (3) the testimony of the MSS, and (4) the evidence we have in regard to the name of the author. With regard to the antecedent probabilities of the case, I believe that no one who is moderately well acquainted with mediaeval literary history would contend that the continuation commonly called A<sup>2</sup> is a priori more likely to be the work of the author of A<sup>1</sup> than of some other writer, or that it is a priori less probable that a writer should have revised and expanded another man's work than that he should have revised and expanded a work of his own. All of these processes occur so commonly that one is intrinsically as probable as the other. No presumption in favor of single authorship, therefore, can be founded upon antecedent probability.

I intend to leave for a later article the discussion of the question whether the MSS and the data we have in regard to the author's name furnish any grounds for a presumption in favor of the theory of single authorship, and I shall confine myself in the present article to a consideration of the "tradition" which Mr. Jusserand cites as evidence for his belief that all the texts of *Piers the Plowman* are the

<sup>1</sup>This disposition to place the burden of proof upon the advocates of multiple authorship is not confined to Jusserand, Chambers, and Mensendieck; on the contrary, it is a rather general attitude toward the problem. Mr. Emerson voiced the opinion of many other scholars when he said in 1908 (in a footnote to a passage upon some aberrations of higher critics): "It is right to say that these strictures have in no sense been suggested by the new question of the authorship of *Piers Plowman*. On that question it is too early to form an opinion. Yet the attitude of skepticism toward the separatist doctrine seems to me the soundest until the proof is unmistakable" (*Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, XXIV, lxxxiii).

work of a single writer. I understand the word "tradition" as meaning the opinions of scholars as to the single or multiple authorship of *Piers the Plowman*, from the time of Crowley, the first editor, to the date at which Mr. Manly made public his theory of multiple authorship. At that date the theory of single authorship was accepted without question. We must inquire, however, upon what evidence and by means of what arguments did this theory become the universally accepted one? For a consensus of scholarly opinion has no probative value or authority in itself. Its value is solely that of the arguments by which a consensus of opinion was arrived at. And so in this case, it is the logical process, not the resulting consensus of opinion, that demands our consideration.

The most important fact for us to bear in mind in estimating the value of this tradition is that until the year 1802 scholars knew the poem in one form only, that of the B-text. I do not, of course, mean to say that no scholar had ever examined an A-text or C-text MS previous to that date. Even Crowley, who in 1550 printed the poem from a B-text MS, had access also to a MS of the C-text and another of the A-text.<sup>1</sup> After quoting from his copy of the B-text lines 328, 329 of Passus VI, he remarks that other copies read differently and quotes two corresponding lines of the C-text, 351, 352 of Passus IX. In a later impression of his edition he inserts some A-text lines which do not appear in his first impression. But his observations were not thorough enough to disclose to him the fact that the MSS of the A-, B-, and C-texts contain, not merely variant readings such as he had noticed, but three distinct redactions of the poem. Nevertheless, Crowley exhibits a better knowledge of the poem than any other scholar previous to Tyrwhitt. Bale, Stow, Selden, Pits, Wood, and the other writers who mention the poem give us no hint whatever of the existence of three different texts, but speak of the poem as if it had one invariable form.<sup>2</sup> Tanner also, though he had access to at least one MS of the A-text and two of the C-text, as well as Crowley's printed edition of the B-text, does not recognize the existence of more than one version of the poem.<sup>3</sup> It seems most probable

<sup>1</sup> Skeat, *Piers the Plowman*, Parallel Text, II, lxxiv-lxxvi.

<sup>2</sup> See the various notices from these writers printed by Skeat in his *Piers Plowman*, E.E.T.S., Part IV, pp. 866 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Tanner mentions among others MS Ashmole 1468 [A-text], MS Digby 102 [C-text], and MS Digby 171 [C-text]; see his *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica*, I, 1748, p. 504.

that all of these writers knew the poem chiefly in its printed form, for a collation of an A-text or C-text MS with the printed text would at once have made evident the distinction of texts. Even Warton, heroic reader of MSS though he was, quotes only from Crowley's edition, and gives no indication of knowing the poem in any different form.<sup>1</sup>

Tyrwhitt, in 1775, cites Crowley's edition, but notices variations between this text and MS Cotton Vesp. B. XVI (a C-text MS) and refers to another C-text MS, Harl. 2376.<sup>2</sup> Tyrwhitt just missed discovering the true difference between the B- and C-texts, for he says, "I cannot help observing, that these Visions have been printed from so faulty and imperfect a MS that the author, whoever he was, would find it difficult to recognize his own work."<sup>3</sup> This observation must have been the result of a collation of his printed copy of the B-text with one of the C-text MSS that he knew. The collation, however, could not have been a thorough one, for it does not seem to have caused him to suspect that the variations among *Piers the Plowman* MSS were either greater in extent or different in character from the variations which he knew to exist among the MSS of the *Canterbury Tales*.

Ritson finally, in 1802, made the distinction between the B-text and the C-text which Tyrwhitt had just failed of making. Ritson says:

In order to enable any curious person to distinguish at first sight to which of the two editions (as one may call them) any new MS he may hapen to meet with belongs, a parallel extract is here given from each:

The printed copys, and (in substance) the *Harleian MSS* 3954 [A-text], 875 [A-text], and 6041 [A- and C-texts]; the Vernon MS [A-text] in the Bodleian, Hales, in *Lincolns-Inn* [A-text], and others, without noticeing the verbal alterations or corruptions of the copyists, commence as follows:

[He quotes from Crowley's edition the first 10 lines of the Prolog.]

The MSS *Vespasian B. XVI* [C-text], *Caligula A. II. 18B. XVI* [?], *Harleian*, 2376 [C-text], Mr. Douce's [C-text] and others, nearly agree in reading thus:

<sup>1</sup> *History of English Poetry*, L., 1774, I, 266 ff. In his *Observations on the Fairy Queen*, however, he had cited three Bodleian MSS, one of which, Digby 102, is a C-text MS. (*op. cit.*, L., 1807, II, 251).

<sup>2</sup> *Canterbury Tales*, Oxford 1798, I, 45, 46, note 57 to the *Essay on the Language and Versification of Chaucer*.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 46.

[He quotes from Cotton Vesp. B. XVI the first 11 lines of Passus I of the C-text.]

The subsequent variations, throughout the poem, are still more considerable; so that it appears highly probable that the author had revised his original work, and given, as it were, a new edition; and it may be possible for a good judge of ancient poetry, possessed of a sufficient stock of critical acumen, to determine which was the first, and which the second.<sup>1</sup>

It will be noted, however, that Ritson's examination of A-text MSS was not sufficiently thorough to enable him to discover that the poem exists in three distinct forms, not merely two. Probably he collated the A-text MSS only through the opening lines, in which the A-text and B-text agree closely with each other, and made his more extensive collation between Crowley's edition and Cotton Vesp. B. XVI.

We are now in a position to understand why no sixteenth-, seventeenth-, or eighteenth-century scholar raised the question of single or multiple authorship of *Piers the Plowman*. They knew the poem in one form only, that of the B-text. So long as the A-text and C-text were unknown, it was impossible that the question of single or multiple authorship should be raised. If modern scholars knew only the B-text, there would be no *Piers the Plowman* problem, for the B-text is so intricately composite in character that it would be impossible for us to distinguish without the aid of the A-text between original and added or interpolated matter. And likewise with reference to the problem of the B-text and C-text, there would be no question of their common or diverse authorship as long as the C-text remained unknown. We should therefore be misrepresenting scholarly tradition previous to Ritson if we said that it held the opinion that *Piers the Plowman* was the work of a single author. It held only that the B-text of *Piers the Plowman* was the work of a single author, which is an altogether different proposition. There was, indeed, no rational alternative to this opinion.

It was Ritson's discovery of the C-text that raised the question of single or multiple authorship. Immediately the question presented itself, did the author revise his own work, or was the revision the work of some other than the original writer? Ritson himself, as we have seen, decided in favor of the former hypothesis, but he gives

<sup>1</sup> *Bibliographia Poetica, A Catalogue of English [sic] Poets of the Twelfth, Thirteenth, Fourteenth, Fifteenth, and Sixteenth, Centuries*, pp. 29, 30.

no reasons for so doing. When we remember that Ritson did not know which of the two texts was the earlier one, it becomes clear that he must have decided the question upon a priori grounds rather than from a consideration of the characteristics of the texts themselves. Whitaker, who edited the C-text in 1813 and who was the next scholar to attack the problem that Ritson had opened up, was even more heavily handicapped than his predecessor in his investigation of the authorship of the two texts. For while Ritson confessed his ignorance as to the relative dates of the B-text and C-text, Whitaker adopted the erroneous opinion that the C-text was the original and the B-text the revision. Whitaker saw the problem clearly enough and realized that he must make a choice between two hypotheses. The degree of deference that we owe, however, to his decision in favor of a common authorship of the B- and C-texts can best be indicated by quoting in full his discussion of the subject. He says, after speaking of the differences between the MSS (especially Crowley's and his own) and of the fact that they form two distinct schools:

All these varieties, however, bear marks, not of the same spirit and genius only, but of the same peculiar and original manner, so that it is scarcely to be conceived that they are interpolations of successive transcribers. Whatever be the cause, however, it may confidently be affirmed, that the text of no ancient work whatever contains so many various readings, or differs so widely from itself.

To account for this phenomenon, however, in the penury, or rather in the absence of original information relating to the author, we are at liberty to suppose that the first edition of his work appeared when he was a young man, and that he lived and continued in the habit of transcribing to extreme old age. But a man of *his* genius would not submit to the drudgery of mere transcription; his invention and judgment would always be at work; new abuses, and therefore new objects of satire, would emerge from time to time; and as a new language began to be spoken, he might, though unwillingly, be induced to adopt its modernisms, in order to render his work intelligible to a second or third generation of readers. In this last respect, however, it is not improbable that his transcribers might use some freedoms; for while we deny them invention to add, we may at least allow them skill to translate.<sup>1</sup>

I think it must be admitted that we can attach no importance whatever to Whitaker's opinion. The weakness of his position does not

<sup>1</sup> *Vision Willi de Petro Plouhman*, ed. Whitaker, p. xxxiii.

consist merely in the insufficiency of his arguments<sup>1</sup> and the fact that his opinion appears to be the result of an impression, not of an adequate investigation of the problem, but in the fact that he argued from premises that would have vitiated completely the results even of the most thorough investigation. Whitaker knew nothing of the A-text and believed the C-text to have been earlier than the B-text. He was therefore obliged to beg the question to the extent of assuming that the writer of the C-text was the original author of everything which that text contains, including a very large amount of material that belonged originally to the A-text. On the other hand, passages of the B-text that are omitted in the C-text (many of which, e.g., B. III. 188-199, B. IV. 67-73, had originally appeared in the A-text) seemed to Whitaker to be the additions of the reviser. To derive correct conclusions from such premises was a logical impossibility.

It was Price, the editor of the 1824 edition of Warton's *History of English Poetry*, who made possible a more intelligent investigation of the *Piers the Plowman* problem by discovering the A-text and at least suggesting that it was the earliest form of the poem and that the B-text was earlier, instead of later, than the C-text. Price says:

It is among the remarks contained in Dr. Whitaker's preface, that the variations between his own manuscript and Crowley's text are so material, as to warrant a belief that the original writer had at some time chosen to remould his work, and that both versions have come down to us. This conclusion is strongly borne out by the amplifications in the Oxford manuscript, which, while they support the integrity of the early printed copies, clearly show that these variations are too important to have been the result of a common transcriber's caprice, or to have emanated, as Mr. Tyrwhitt believed, from the ignorance, negligence, or wilful interpolation of Crowley. But the inference which Dr. Whitaker has coupled with this remark—that his own manuscript exhibits the poem in its original state, and that Crowley's text affords a specimen of the more recent *rifacimento*,—is not to be admitted without considerable hesitation. Among the Harley manuscripts there is a fragment of this poem written upon vellum (No. 875) [an A-text MS

<sup>1</sup> His argument that the two texts exhibit the same spirit is too indefinite to be of value, for he does not define this spirit in such a way as to give us an opportunity of judging whether it is really individual enough to serve as evidence of common authorship, and of ascertaining whether it is as a matter of fact common to the B- and C-texts. The stylistic argument will be considered at a later point in this article. The suppositions Whitaker makes for the purpose of accounting for the existence of the revised form would apply as well to a revision made by a new writer as to one made by the original author of the work.



lacking VI. 52—VII. 2 and all after VIII. 144] of an equally early date with *Vespasian B. XVI.* and in a character nearly resembling it. Unhappily this fragment only extends to the 151st line of the 8th Passus, nor is it free from lacunae even thus far. Our loss is however in some measure repaired—perhaps wholly so—by the preservation of a transcript on paper, in the same collection (No. 6041) [A- and C-texts], which though considerably younger, and somewhat modernised in its orthography, exhibits a much more correct and intelligible text. From this manuscript it is evident, that another and a third version was once in circulation; and if the first draught of the poem be still in existence, it is here perhaps that we must look for it. For in this the narrative is considerably shortened, many passages of a decidedly episodic cast—such as the tale of the cat and the rats, and the character of Wrath—are wholly omitted; others, which in the later versions are given with considerable detail of circumstance, are here but slightly sketched; and though evidently the text book of Dr. Whitaker's and Crowley's versions, it may be said to agree with neither, but to alternate between the ancient and the modern printed copies.<sup>1</sup>

This passage is an important document in the history of scholarly opinion regarding the authorship of the various texts of *Piers the Plowman*, for Price was the first modern scholar who had the knowledge that was necessary for an intelligent consideration of the problem. He contributed nothing, of course, toward proving the theory of single authorship, for he did not offer a single argument to support it. The important thing to observe is that he was the first modern scholar to hold the opinion afterward adopted by Skeat and still held by Jusserand, that all three texts of the poem are the work of a single writer. The "tradition" to which Mr. Jusserand appeals begins with Price in 1824.

Price's discovery of the A-text, important though it was, appears to have attracted little attention, for Wright, who edited the B-text in 1842, recognized the existence of the two later texts only.<sup>2</sup> Wright's introduction to his text is notable in two respects: it declares unequivocally the priority of the B-text as against the C-text, and it argues that the revision found in the C-text is the work of some other person than the original author. The most important passage for our purpose is the following:

<sup>1</sup> Warton, *History of English Poetry*, L, 1824, II, 482, 483. For some other remarks upon the A-text, see *ibid.*, II, 102, 103.

<sup>2</sup> Yet Wright had examined at least one A-text MS, Trinity College, Cambridge, R. 3. 14 (*Vision and Creed of Piers Ploughman*, ed. Wright, L, 1856, I, xl).

The manuscripts of the *Vision of Piers Ploughman* are extremely numerous both in public and in private collections. There are at least eight in the British Museum: there are ten or twelve in the Cambridge Libraries; and they are not less numerous at Oxford. As might be expected in a popular work like this, the manuscripts are in general, full of variations; but there are two classes of manuscripts which give two texts that are widely different from each other, those variations commencing even with the first lines of the poem. One of these texts, which was adopted in the early printed editions, is given in the present volumes; the other text was selected for publication by Dr. Whitaker. The following extract, comprising the first lines of the poem, will show how each text begins, and will enable those who possess manuscripts of *Piers Ploughman* to ascertain at once to which text they belong. [Here follow the extracts.]

Besides such variations as appear in the foregoing specimen, there are in the second text many considerable additions, omissions, and transpositions. It would not be easy to account for the existence of two texts differing so much; but it is my impression that the first was the one published by the author, and that the variations were made by some other person, who was perhaps induced by his own political sentiments to modify passages, and was gradually led on to publish a revision of the whole. It is certain that in some parts of Text II the strong sentiments or expressions of the first text are softened down. We may give as an example of this, the statement of the popular opinion of the origin and purpose of kingly government: [Here he quotes B. Pro. 112-22, and C. I. 139-46].

Nobody, I think, can deny that in this instance the doctrine is stated far more distinctly and far more boldly in the first text than in the second. In general the first text is the best, whether we look at the mode in which the sentiments are stated, or at the poetry and language.<sup>1</sup>

Whether we agree with Wright's opinion or not, we must acknowledge that his discussion of the problem of the B- and C-texts is distinctly superior to that of his predecessors. Though he ignores the existence of the A-text, his knowledge of the priority of the B-text insured him in a very large measure from the absurdities of reasoning to which Whitaker was liable. Besides, his knowledge of the variations between the B- and C-texts was far more complete than that of Whitaker and Price, for he had made a detailed comparison of the two texts and prints in his notes most of the passages that are peculiar to the later one. His argument for diversity of authorship is of course not conclusive, but it would have been worthy of considera-

<sup>1</sup> *Vision and Creed of Piers Ploughman*, ed. Wright, L., 1856, I, xxxii ff. Compare also Wright's comparison of the two texts in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, April, 1834, pp. 385 ff., especially his acute observations upon lines 28 (C. I. 15) and 2 (C. I. 49).

tion even if better arguments had previously been offered in support of the contrary opinion. And, as we have already seen, no valid argument had yet been made for the theory of single authorship.

We have now come to the period of Mr. Skeat's work upon the *Piers the Plowman* texts. Of his extensive and accurate learning, his tireless industry, his devotion to scholarship, and his readiness to abandon a controversial position when it had been proved untenable, it is scarcely possible to speak in terms of too high praise, and his opinion upon the *Piers the Plowman* problem is justly entitled to most respectful consideration. But no opinion can have any higher authority than that of the process of reasoning that led to its adoption, and in weighing the value of Mr. Skeat's opinion we can follow no other course than that of weighing the value of the arguments that he advances in its favor.

The earliest piece of argument that we find is the following passage in the introduction to the A-text, published in 1867:

That most of the additional matter in both the later forms of the poem was by Langland himself I have little doubt; his style is very peculiar, and many of the subsequently interpolated passages are the very best of the whole. It is easy to say that others may have added to it; but the question is, who *could* have done so? There were not two Langlands, surely; and though there are other (anonymous) alliterative poems of considerable merit, such as, for instance, "William of Palerne," I greatly doubt if they reach the high standard of poetical power which is conspicuous in *Piers Plowman*.<sup>1</sup>

The first of these arguments is that from the peculiarity of the style of the *Piers the Plowman* texts. We must agree with Mr. Skeat that the style is indeed peculiar and quite distinct from that of *William of Palerne* and other alliterative poems. But it is equally certain that it was a style that not one man merely, but many men, had at their command. This is one of the circumstances that make the textual criticism of the poems so difficult. The MSS contain hundreds of lines and short passages written in this peculiar style, which can be declared spurious only from a knowledge of the genealogical relationships of the MSS. Mr. Skeat's edition of A<sup>1</sup> alone contains nearly fifty lines that are omitted in the critical text.<sup>2</sup> Who

<sup>1</sup> *Piers Plowman*, E.E.T.S., Part I, p. xxxiii.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Thomas A. Knott's (not yet published) critical text of A. Pro. 1-VIII. 131 contains 1,728 lines; Mr. Skeat's text contains up to that point 1,777 lines.

can decide, upon stylistic evidence alone, how much of Passus XII of the A-text was written by John But and how much was written by the author of the preceding passus? There are almost as many possibilities as there are lines in the passus,<sup>1</sup> and Mr. Chambers has very properly argued that it is impossible to decide from internal evidence alone where the break occurs, and that we must be guided by the evidence of the MSS.<sup>2</sup> The numerous passages of the B-text which are peculiar to MS Rawl. Poet. 38 are written in a style that cannot be distinguished from that of the other additions in the B-text, but their genuineness must remain a matter of grave doubt unless a study of the MSS relations should furnish evidence of their authenticity.<sup>3</sup> Finally, as Mr. Skeat acknowledged, *Richard the Redeles* is written in this same peculiar style, but it has never been proved to have been of a common authorship with any or all of the *Piers the Plowman* texts.<sup>4</sup> These facts show, I think, that Mr. Skeat's stylistic argument is valueless.

The other argument advanced in the passage quoted above is of no greater value than the argument we have just examined. Mr. Skeat asks, "If Langland did not write all of the texts, who could have written them?" In this interrogation are combined two distinct arguments. One is that we have no trustworthy attribution of *Piers the Plowman* to any other author than Langland, and that

<sup>1</sup> In or shortly before 1867 Mr. Skeat was still uncertain as to the genuineness of the first 18 lines of the passus which were all he had discovered up to that time (*Piers Plowman*. E.E.T.S., Part I, pp. xxvi, xxvii). Very shortly after, however, when he became acquainted with MS Rawl. Poet. 137, Mr. Skeat was convinced that it was "Langland's beyond a doubt, every word of it, from line 1 down to the end of line 100" (l. 105 of Parallel Text). He says, "All these lines are not only in his manner, but contain his favourite words, phrases, and turns of expression, and have the same changes of rhythm as we find in his works elsewhere" (*ibid.*, p. 143\*). At a later time he suspected the genuineness of the last seven of these lines and suggested that John But began at line 99 (Parallel Text, II, ix). Mr. Manly thought it probable that John But began at line 57 (*Cambridge History of English Literature*, II, 25). Miss Rickert believes that he began at about line 78 (*Modern Philology*, XI, 113). Mr. Chambers would place the change at line 89 (*Modern Language Review*, VI, 320).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, VI, 322.

<sup>3</sup> This MS contains 160 lines not found in other MSS of the B-text (Skeat, Parallel Text, II, lxxviii). Mr. Skeat accepted these lines as genuine.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Skeat's argument in favor of common authorship is contained in his E.E.T.S. edition of the C-text, pp. cvii ff., and assumes what cannot now be granted, that the three texts of *Piers the Plowman* are all the work of a single author; moreover, the stylistic resemblances between those texts and *Richard the Redeles* are an important part of the evidence Mr. Skeat offers to prove the common authorship of that poem and *Piers the Plowman*.

Langland must therefore be the author of all of the texts. This argument *a silentio* is seen to be valueless when we remember that the great bulk (probably as much as two-thirds) of the fourteenth century literature that we have is anonymous. Why, then, should the hypothesis of anonymous authorship be barred in the case of *Piers the Plowman*? There can be no reasonable objection to the supposition that Langland may have been the author of one of the texts, and that one or more anonymous authors may have written the others.<sup>1</sup>

There is also implied in Mr. Skeat's query the *a priori* argument that it is improbable that there should have been at this period more than one poet of the degree of ability demanded by a theory of multiple authorship. This argument is rather discredited by the fact that it has generally been employed in bad cases. It has been used to support the theory that Cædmon wrote the poems in the Junian MS; that Cynewulf wrote the *Andreas* and the *Beowulf*; that Huchown wrote 50,000 lines of anonymous alliterative verse; that Bacon wrote Shakespeare's plays and the *Faerie Queene*. It has underlying it the assumption that a poet of great merit generally appears alone, though it would be nearer the truth to say that the great poet is nearly always accompanied or succeeded by several other poets of nearly equal rank. In view of the fact that the theory of multiple authorship requires us to posit only two poets of high ability (the author of A<sup>1</sup> and the author of the B-text) it must be conceded that Mr. Skeat's *a priori* argument is wholly inconclusive.

His other arguments in support of single authorship are contained in the introduction to his edition of the C-text, published in 1873. In discussing the transpositions to Passus VII and VIII which the writer of the C-text made of material upon the seven deadly sins that had originally appeared in Passus XIII of the B-text, Mr. Skeat says:

These [transpositions] can all be explained together. It is quite clear on what principle the poet made them; and, if they be carefully examined, they will be found to be *so skilfully adjusted as quite to exclude the supposition*

<sup>1</sup> This, fortunately, is the only point at which an examination of the scholarly tradition complicates itself with the matter of the evidence as to authorship afforded by the information we have as to the name of the author. I hope to show in my later article that the evidence as to the author's name lends no support whatever to the theory of single authorship.

that anyone but himself could have done it. This is a very important matter, as it assures us that the double revision of the poem is *all his own work*; and, although this might have been inferred from the style and character of the writing, it is most satisfactory to have the proof of it brought home to us in a way that cannot well be mistaken.<sup>1</sup>

The limitations of space make it impossible to reproduce here the passages that Mr. Skeat bases his argument upon; the reader will have to test the soundness of the argument by his own examination of the text.<sup>2</sup> To me these transpositions appear to be of a kind that a reviser, if he had considered it desirable, might have made quite as well as the original author, for the principle they follow is purely a mechanical one. The writer has merely amplified the confessions of the seven deadly sins which appear in B. V, by interpolating at appropriate places the portrayals of the seven deadly sins which had formed part of the description of *Activa Vita's* coat in B. XIII. That these transpositions are made with any great degree of skill will not, I think, be admitted by anyone who will read carefully the confession of Sloth, C. VIII. 63-119, and observe the awkwardness of lines 70 ff. in their new context. To me this argument is of no force at all; to no one, I believe, could it be a strong one. At any rate, whatever weight it might be judged to have, it could tend only to prove the common authorship of the B- and C-texts; it can of course prove nothing with regard to a common authorship of the A- and B-texts.<sup>3</sup>

Mr. Skeat continues the passage quoted above by saying:

It is also the more necessary, because there certainly are indications that the poet inclined, at the last, to the softening down and modification of some of his sentiments. Mr. Wright has drawn attention to this in one instance, where he prints two short passages side by side, and draws the inference that "in this instance the doctrine is stated far more distinctly and far more boldly in the first text than in the second;" Wright's edition, Pref. p. xxxv. That is to say, the poet grew more conservative in his ideas and more careful in his expressions as he grew older; a result so common and natural that it is not to be wondered at, but may be accepted as the fact.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Piers Plowman*, E.E.T.S., Part III, p. lxxix.

<sup>2</sup> See Parallel Text, I, 130 ff.

<sup>3</sup> It will be remembered that the illogicality of the description of *Activa Vita's* coat is one of the evidences Mr. Manly offers (*Cambridge History of English Literature*, II, 30) of the difference between the mental qualities of A<sup>1</sup> and B.

<sup>4</sup> *Piers Plowman*, E.E.T.S., Part III, p. lxxix.



This very indirect statement (which suppresses the inference Wright actually drew from the parallel passages) is the only allusion Mr. Skeat ever made to his predecessor's theory in regard to the authorship of the C-text. Wright's suggestion had fallen upon sterile soil; so far from provoking inquiry and stimulating investigation, it was almost completely ignored.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Skeat's final argument upon this question is also contained in his introduction to the C-text. In regard to one of the additional passages in the C-text, Passus IV. 292-415, he says:

A passage of that subtle and simile-seeking character which was no doubt once highly esteemed, but to us seems tedious and puerile. The author undertakes to establish parallels between the two kinds of Meed and the two kinds of grammatical relation. In tone and style it is much like another tedious passage in which the mystery of the Trinity is exemplified by reference to a man's hand or to a blazing torch, which first appears in the B-text (xvii 135-249). Any one who carefully compares these passages (i.e. if he thinks it worth his while) may easily see that the writer of one of them would be just the man to write the other. In other words, we cannot well put aside this passage as not genuine, because the author has already previously committed himself by penning a passage equally dull.<sup>2</sup>

The value of this argument is impaired (to say the least) by the fact that Mr. Manly has drawn from the passage on Meed and the grammatical relations an inference directly opposite to that which Mr. Skeat drew. The passage, in Mr. Manly's opinion, has no parallel elsewhere in the poems and is evidence of a quality of dry pedantry in the mind of C which does not appear in the writer (or writers) of the earlier texts.<sup>3</sup> Whether or not the passage in the C-text be accepted as good evidence of a difference of authorship, the parallel Mr. Skeat cites from the B-text cannot be accepted as proving, or even tending strongly to prove, the common authorship of these two texts. The two passages are not really of the same character. Mr. Skeat himself says in his note upon the passage in the C-text that it is "the dullest passage which our author ever wrote." The passage

<sup>1</sup> G. P. Marsh, however, accepted Wright's view; see his *Origin and History of the English Language* (originally published in 1862), New York, 1877, p. 297. The passage is not included in Mr. Skeat's extracts from Marsh (Parallel Text, II, xlvii ff.).

<sup>2</sup> *Piers Plowman*, E.E.T.S., Part III, p. lxxxvi.

<sup>3</sup> This argument does not (I think) appear in Mr. Manly's published work, but was communicated by him to his seminar in 1908.

in the B-text is not of a very exceptional kind; it is difficult to follow and not in the least illuminating, but it was the sort of thing that almost any didactic writer might occasionally indulge in, and Mr. Skeat cites in his notes parallels from St. Augustine and Aelfric.<sup>1</sup> But the passage in the C-text (IV. 335-409) is, fortunately, very exceptional indeed; to me at least it is quite unintelligible and utterly barren of all interest.

These are the arguments by which Mr. Skeat justified his belief in a single author of all the texts of *Piers the Plowman*. Unless I have failed in my endeavor to estimate them fairly but exactly at their just value, they are entirely insufficient to prove his case. Toward proving the common authorship of A<sup>1</sup> and A<sup>2</sup>, or of A<sup>2</sup> and B, they contribute no evidence whatever. Toward proving the common authorship of B and C, they contribute two pieces of evidence which no one could regard as conclusive proof, and to which I at least can allow no probative force at all.

We have now completed our examination of the scholarly tradition of a single authorship of the various texts of *Piers the Plowman*, for the passages I have quoted from Mr. Skeat's introductions, published in 1867 and 1873, are the latest discussions of the problem of authorship that I have found prior to Mr. Manly's article in 1906.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Skeat's judgment upon the question was accepted without criticism; opinion became stereotyped; and it was forgotten that there was any alternative to the theory of single authorship. Even Ten Brink appears never to have realized that a theory of multiple authorship was even a possibility that demanded consideration. In this respect his attitude toward the problem was much less scientific than that of the earlier scholars had been. Before Ritson's discovery of the C-text, as we have seen, there was no rational alternative to the theory of a single authorship of the single text that was known to exist. But Ritson himself, and Whitaker after him, realized that it was at least possible that the B-text and the C-text were not the work of the same writer. That Ritson, Whitaker, and Price rejected this hypothesis and attributed both texts to the same

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Skeat parallels the comparison of the Trinity and the torch, but not that of the Trinity and the hand.

<sup>2</sup> *Modern Philology*, III, 359 ff.

author ought not to have influenced subsequent opinion, for they offered not an iota of valid argument in defense of the theory of single authorship which they adopted. Wright's argument that the C-text was the work of some other person than the writer of the B-text, though it was of course far from conclusive, should at least have led to a more thoughtful and adequate consideration of the hypothesis of multiple authorship than that hypothesis actually received at the hands of Mr. Skeat and later scholars. But Wright's suggestion bore no fruit, and Mr. Skeat contented himself with offering on behalf of his theory of single authorship the small and inconclusive body (or rather fragments) of argument that we have just examined.

This is the scholarly tradition respecting the authorship of the texts of *Piers the Plowman*. I shall leave my reader to form his own opinion as to whether it establishes any presumption against a theory of the multiple authorship of those texts, or places the burden of proof upon those who hold that theory.

SAMUEL MOORE

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN



## THE SOUTHWESTERN COWBOY SONGS AND THE ENGLISH AND SCOTTISH POPULAR BALLADS

Several writers recently have found analogy between the conditions attending the growth of cowboy songs in isolated communities in the Southwest, and the conditions under which arose the English and Scottish popular ballads—those problematic pieces which form so special a chapter in the history of English poetry. Mr. Lomax, the chief collector of southwestern folk songs,<sup>1</sup> notes, when speaking of western communities, how “illiterate people and people cut off from newspapers and books, isolated and lonely—thrown back on primal resources for entertainment and for the expression of emotion—utter themselves through somewhat the same character of songs as did their forefathers of perhaps a thousand years ago.” Professor Barrett Wendell<sup>2</sup> suggests that it is possible to trace in this group of American ballads “the precise manner in which songs and cycles of songs—obviously analogous to those surviving from older and antique times—have come into being. The facts which are still available concerning the ballads of our own Southwest are such as should go far to prove, or to disprove, many of the theories advanced concerning the laws of literature as evinced in the ballads of the Old World.” Ex-President Roosevelt affirms in a personal letter to Mr. Lomax<sup>3</sup> that “there is something very curious in the reproduction here on this new continent of essentially the conditions of ballad-growth which obtained in mediaeval England.”

The parallel felt by these writers is worked out, with more specific detail and greater definiteness, by Professor W. W. Lawrence, in a passage prefixed to a discussion of the ballads of Robin Hood:<sup>4</sup>

These men, living together on the solitary ranches of Texas, Arizona, or New Mexico, have been accustomed to entertain each other after the

<sup>1</sup> *Cowboy Songs*. Collected by John A. Lomax. New York, 1910. See also G. W. Will, “Songs of Western Cowboys,” *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, XXII, XXVI.

<sup>2</sup> Lomax, *Cowboy Songs*, Introduction.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Prefixed letter, dated from Cheyenne, 1910.

<sup>4</sup> *Medieval Story*. New York, 1911.

day's work is done by singing songs, some of which have been familiar to them from boyhood, others of which they have actually composed themselves. . . . These cowboy ballads are not the expression of individuals but of the whole company which listens to them, and they are, in a very real sense, the work of other men than the author. . . . The author counts for nothing, it will be observed; his name is generally not remembered, and what he invents is as characteristic of his comrades as of himself. . . . Here we have literature which is a perfect index of the social ideals of the body of men among whom it is composed, literature which makes no pretense to literary form or to the disclosure of the emotions of any one man as distinguished from his fellows. There are few communities of the present day which are as closely united in common aims and sympathies as these bands of Western cowboys, hence there are few opportunities for the production of verse which is as truly the expression of universal emotion as are these songs.

Such Western ranches reproduce almost perfectly the conditions under which the English popular ballads were composed. . . .

It is obvious from these passages that their writers find a real parallel between the conditions leading to the growth in our own time, in certain homogeneous communities of the Southwest, of fugitive folk pieces like those gathered by Mr. Lomax, and the conditions responsible for the rise in the Middle Ages of the traditional ballads of England and Scotland. For the student of both folk-lore and literature, the parallel so clearly set forth in the paragraphs last quoted has strong interest; and its possibilities of instructiveness are warrant for making it the basis for a brief special examination. Wherein does it hold? How far is it to be pushed? What, if anything, is indicated concerning the Old World pieces by their New World analogues? Of the two leading schools of thought concerning the genesis of the English and Scottish ballads, that which may be designated the "Harvard school" emphasizes the idea of real communal composition, as by a collective village community, and adheres to a definition by origins for genuine popular ballads; that which may be called the English school<sup>1</sup> defines by destination and style. For the mass of traditional English and Scottish folk-ballads it finds necessary the hypothesis of a higher

<sup>1</sup> See chiefly W. J. Courthope, *History of English Poetry*, I (1895); G. G. Smith, *The Transition Period*, vi (1900); W. P. Ker, *On the History of the Ballads, 1100-1500* (1910); and T. F. Henderson, *Scottish Vernacular Literature* (1898); Introduction to *Scott's Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border* (1902); and *The Ballad in Literature* (1912).



origin than spontaneous popular collaboration. Which, if either, of these schools may find support in the parallel under discussion; if it be true, as Professor Wendell suggests, that the facts concerning western songs may "go far to prove, or to disprove, many of the theories advanced concerning the laws of literature as evinced in the ballads of the Old World", in which direction, if either, is the student of English balladry led?

Let us first examine, for the sake of the generalizations to be made, the subject-matter of the American pieces, and their style.

A certain percentage of the songs in the collection of Mr. Lomax are perhaps genuine cowboy pieces, approached from almost any point of view. Those which are most typical are related very closely to the life of the communities which originated and preserved them. Some of these, the editor tells us, the singers themselves composed. There are songs dealing with the life of the ranch, of the trail, songs of stampedes, of the barroom; but chiefly they deal with cattle and the cowboys who have them in charge. There are a few passing references to their "bosses"; but songs relating to these, or to the ranch-owners, songs of the lives of their employers and their families, do not appear. A few preserve the style of the ultra-sentimental or "flowery" period of American verse,<sup>1</sup> with doubtfully westernized setting, a few are ascribed to personal authors,<sup>2</sup> and some are plainly built on or out of well-known songs;<sup>3</sup> but these are not wholly typical. Of what may be termed the real cowboy pieces, the following verses, cited as representative by Professor Lawrence also, will give a good idea:

I'm a rowdy cowboy just off the stormy plains,  
My trade is girting saddles and pulling bridle reins,  
Oh, I can tip the lasso, it is with graceful ease;  
I rope a streak of lightning, and ride it where I please.  
My bosses they all like me, they say I am hard to beat;

<sup>1</sup>"By Markentura's Flowery Marge," p. 224; or the story of Amanda and Young Albon, p. 271.

<sup>2</sup>"Night-Herding Song," p. 324; or "The Metis Song of the Buffalo Hunters," p. 72.

<sup>3</sup>"The Cowboy's Dream" (based on "My Bonnie Lies over the Ocean"), p. 18; or "The Railroad Corral" (see Sir Walter Scott's "Bonny Dundee"), p. 318. "The Little Old Sod Shanty on the Claim," p. 187, widely known in the Mid-West, is an adaptation, it seems to the present writer, of the once very popular "The Little Old Log Cabin in the Lane."

I give them the bold stand off, you bet I have got the cheek.  
 I always work for wages, my pay I get in gold;  
 I am bound to follow the longhorn steer until I am too old.  
 Ci yi yip yip yip pe ya.

Or—

Come all you jolly cowboys that follow the bronco steer,  
 I'll sing to you a verse or two your spirits for to cheer;  
 It's all about a trip, a trip that I did undergo  
 On that crooked trail to Holbrook, in Arizona oh.

Or—

Bill driv the stage from Independence  
 Up to the Smokey Hill;  
 And everybody knowed him thar  
 As Independence Bill,—  
 Thar warn't no feller on the route  
 That driv with half the skill.

As might be foreseen, though picturesque and often forceful, these pieces are crude and nearly formless, without literary quality or individual touch.<sup>1</sup> Also they tend to be songs rather than ballads; they are more likely to express collective or individual feeling than to be verse narratives. There is an established manner, but it is crude; real poetical quality they can hardly be said to have. The *Stoff* is relatively unambitious and was found by the composers close at hand. No doubt it is compositions of this nature to which may fairly be ascribed the communal origin suggested by Mr. Lomax and sketched out by Professor Lawrence. These might well have found their origin in the improvisation of a community isolated and homogeneous; and they well reflect the life, the tastes, the themes, and song modes, of those among whom they are current. To reiterate, they deal as a mass with the life and the interests of the same class of people that originate them and sing them. And among this class, it is tempting to add, the pieces so composed are likely to die!

Suppose that we endeavor to distinguish, among the songs collected by Mr. Lomax, those which have found widest diffusion

<sup>1</sup> It is more than likely that even these compositions are built from well-known songs, like those cited in the preceding footnote, i.e., are adaptations. Most of them follow the model of stall ballads, or "Come all ye's," as they are sometimes designated. Of course it would be only the framework, the suggestion that is so given; the rest would be the work of some adapter, or, it may be, series of adapters.

and greatest promise of permanence. They are not those which may fairly be thought to have originated on southwestern ranches, but rather those which may fairly be thought not to have originated there. Currency and diffusion, a sort of permanence, have been gained by a number of the better pieces; but they are pieces not peculiar to the cowboys or to the Southwest; they deal rather with outside life and topics. The very first, "O bury me not on the lone prairie," or "The Dying Cowboy," despite its title, is no communal cowboy improvisation. It has been recovered from oral tradition in Missouri, Kentucky, New England, Nebraska, and elsewhere. It is built, as is well known, on a sea piece, accessible in print,<sup>1</sup> "O bury me not in the deep, deep sea." The songs "Jesse James," "The Death of Garfield," "The Days of Forty-Nine," "The Texas Rangers," "The Boston Burglar," and others have been recovered in many states of the Mid-West, East, and South.<sup>2</sup> So with "Young Charlotte," thought by Mr. Phillips Barry to have been composed by a rural poet in Vermont, about two generations ago.<sup>3</sup> "The Dreary Black Hills," has been recovered in Missouri, Nebraska, Wyoming, and elsewhere. A version of "Mississippi Girls," localized to suit quite different conditions,<sup>4</sup> is in the possession of the writer. For songs of the cowboy type quoted from earlier in this paper, a spontaneous origin on the trail may be a probable explanation, but not for those of the type enumerated in the preceding sentences. The latter are more likely to have drifted to than from the Southwest.<sup>5</sup> But be that as it may, it seems to be true that the group which has achieved currency and permanence did not

<sup>1</sup> A text appears in Fulton and Trueblood's *Choice Readings*, Boston, 1883; but the ascription of authorship there is probably not to be trusted.

<sup>2</sup> Additional instances are "Fuller and Warren," "Jerry, Go Ile That Car," "The Cowboy's Lament," "Macaffie's Confession," "The Little Old Sod Shanty," "The Wars of Germany," "Fannie Moore," "Betsy from Pike," "Rosin the Bow."

<sup>3</sup> "Native Balladry in America," *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, XXII, 365-73.

<sup>4</sup> The Old World ballad "The Two Brothers" (Child, 49), in a version in the possession of the writer—otherwise pretty faithful as regards narrative—seems from the surprising "way out in Idaho" of its last line to be well on its way toward becoming a western piece. A version of "Lord Randal" (Child, 12) recovered from railway camps in Colorado, under the name "Johnny Randall," has already become such. See *Modern Language Notes*, January, 1902.

<sup>5</sup> The cowboys wandered into the Southwest from diverse regions and varying cultural conditions; they must have brought with them differing conceptions and models of verse, sung to diverse tunes. Mainly, however, their models would be of the stall or street ballad type.

concern itself with the local and the special in cowboy life, but with the general, i.e., with widely known and interesting events and persons. Some, like the ballads of Jesse James and Cole Younger, or of the death of Garfield, have or had a sort of nation-wide interest. Others have some striking interest of situation or climax, or have more sustained and "artistic" execution, as "Young Charlotte"; or they were perhaps floated into diffusion by special tunefulness.

Surely songs, or ballads proper, or both, are frequently improvised even now in remote or isolated homogeneous communities, as they were in greater degree in the past; but it does not seem that these are the pieces most likely to persist and to find permanent transmission. Behind these spontaneous and inevitably crude compositions there is too little *élan*; not enough quality, poetic style, "art," tunefulness perhaps, not enough universality of appeal.<sup>1</sup> It takes pressure, strong impetus, to "float" a piece into real transmission and diffusion. Even among the Texas cowboys, it is not their communal or improvised "dogie" songs which are likely to persist nearly intact among them for many decades. These rise and die, impermanent and fluctuating by nature. The better chance for life will be had by pieces like "Jesse James," or "Young Charlotte," too regular of rhyme and meter and too symmetrical of structure, though communal by preservation or destination, to be of communal origin. More likely yet, compositions of the character of "After the Ball," "There'll Be a Hot Time," "Juanita," or "Lorena," now belonging to folk-song though not originating as such, will linger among the cowboys long after their local improvisations have perished. The purpose in this paper is not to risk prediction, however, but merely to examine and contrast; and to this it is time to return.

What now of the general nature of the subject-matter and style, as related to the folk and their interests, of the English and Scottish traditional ballads? We have seen that the songs originated by the cowboys deal with the life nearest them and are couched in the rude and nearly formless style most to be expected. They deal

<sup>1</sup> Some songs of spontaneous local composition on Wyoming ranches are in the possession of the writer, and some of similar composition brought by emigrants from mining communities at Newcastle, England. All are crude in form, and show the same commonplaceness and lack of poetical quality as the cowboy pieces.

with the lives and the interests of the people among whom they arose and by whom they were preserved. In the many discussions regarding the authorship of the Old World ballads, the relation of the themes of the songs to the singers has had curiously little emphasis.<sup>1</sup> Yet the subject-matter of the English and Scottish popular ballads, viewed as evidence concerning the nature of their origin, deserves from critics not incidental treatment as a side issue, but to be faced clearly as a main one.

Undoubtedly the shepherds, or knitters, or weavers, the "humble people" of mediaeval communal conditions, paralleled by those on western ranches, originated pieces of their own; as, according to the testimony of Mr. Lomax, the western cowboys occasionally do. A liking for or the gift of song may surely not be denied them. Of what would these songs treat? Would they not be most likely to deal with matters belonging to daily life; to reflect the tastes, civilization, characters, paralleled, say, by "Bill" or the "dogie" songs of the cowboy pieces? Would they not be genuinely, as regards both material and style, the "homely traditional songs of simple people," i.e., be the mediaeval counterparts of the crude pieces for which modern communal origin may be affirmed? Perhaps, too, they would more probably be songs than ballads, be lyric rather than narrative; though on this nothing special hinges.

<sup>1</sup> The matter is dismissed (in a note) in Professor Gummere's *Old English Ballads* (Introd., p. xxvii) with the sentence: "This homogeneous character of a ballad-making folk, by the way, is quite enough to explain the high rank of most personages in the ballads—princes, knights, and so on." But difference between the life and interests of the hall and of the village or rural throng was very marked in the Middle Ages. This class cleavage is reflected in Froissart. Chaucer realized it when he placed knightly matter in the mouths of his aristocratic pilgrims and bourgeois matter in the mouths of those of lower class. In *The Popular Ballad*, Professor Gummere, while treating many matters minutely, contributes on this topic only (p. 309): "The favorite characters of the old ballad of communal tradition are the knight and the lady, wife or maid, who were in the focus of communal view and represented the fairly homogeneous life of that day." As if, for example, the "poor folk in cots" of *Piers Plowman*, or other humble people, were responsible for the references in balladry to bowers and falcons and knightly life, while artisans, peasants, husbandman, common soldiers, they mention not at all? Only in *The Beginnings of Poetry*, a book not primarily treating the English and Scottish popular ballads, is Professor Gummere (pp. 178 ff.) much concerned with the characters and the material of these ballads. Here there is insistence again on homogeneous conditions, the "ballad community." He is content, by specific statement, with purely communal origin for the aristocratic "Edward," "The Two Brothers," and "Babylon."

How far is the hypothesis of the homogeneous character of the mediaeval community historically tenable? Cowboy society is much more homogeneous, tested by its poetry and by the general character of the life reflected, than was the mediaeval society which fostered the English and Scottish popular ballads.

Yet folk-life and folk-themes are the one subject with which the English and Scottish traditional ballads do not deal. In direct contrast with our western pieces, the kind of people who are supposed to have preserved them are the very people who do not appear in them; much as though the cowboys sang never of themselves but only of their employers, or of those above them in the social scale. The subject-matter of the Old World pieces is aristocratic, whether they be romantic-domestic, military, or riddling; this is true, largely, even for the "greenwood" pieces. The English and Scottish ballads are well-wrought poetical tales, not crude songs, and they treat not of humble folk at all, but of kings, princesses, knights, harpers, of Lord Randal, King Estmere, Sir Patrick Spens, Young Hunting, Child Waters, Young Beichan, the Douglas and the Percy. This is true not only of a few special ballads but of the overwhelming mass, by numerical calculation. The half-dozen or so in which appear a mason, a ship-carpenter, a smith, a butler, are exceptional. The ballads are as aristocratic in their material as the metrical romances, or as mediaeval literature in general. They have a distinctive style, too, and real poetical quality, blurred by the manner of their preservation; a quality that improvised pieces, unless adaptations, do not show. The folk preserved them, but did they originate them? Somewhere, as said earlier, behind the theme, story, or melody of the ballad which is to find perpetuation, there must be more than ordinary impetus; widespread interest such as that centering about outlaws like Jesse James or Robin Hood; in battles like those between the Texas Rangers and the Indians, or those of the Scottish Border; in national characters like Garfield, or like the Percy and the Douglas. The pieces that stand out as of better execution or more striking character are those that persist. Improvised origin at some homogeneous folk-gathering would not typically afford the *élan* to bring outside currency. In the ballads collected by Professor Child, those which are nearest to folk life and to folk style, as paralleled by the western pieces, those which might most plausibly have had the type of origin sketched by Professor Kittredge for "The Hangman's Tree,"<sup>1</sup> are those farthest

<sup>1</sup> Introduction to *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, pp. xxv-xxviii. Professor C. Alphonso Smith, "The Negro and the Ballad," in the *University of West Virginia Alumni Bulletin*, January, 1913, suggests as an example of modern communal compo



from the "good" type established by pieces dealing with aristocratic themes.

The ballad last cited, "The Hangman's Tree," is selected as typical to illustrate the probable manner of composition of the English and Scottish ballads, by both Professor Kittredge,<sup>1</sup> who bases his argument on an Americanized version, and Professor Gummere.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, Mr. T. F. Henderson<sup>3</sup> urges of this piece that it is far from a typical instance in that all ballads are not fashioned on the model of this; nor are they by any means so simple in plot or so inevitable in structure and diction. It may be added here that in point of characters the ballad in question is exceptional also. It is nearly the only piece in the collection in which the main characters, at least in the older versions, do not have perforce to be interpreted as people of rank. The versions that we have of "The Hangman's Tree" are neutral; they do not specify. Possibly then this particular ballad *might* afford an instance of humble people improvising about themselves, not choosing some theme more germane to the harper and the castle hall than to the cottage and the village throng. Yet it is as likely, or likelier, that the ballad as we have it has descended from one of definitely higher life; much as "Lord Randal" evolved into the "Johnny Randall" of a Colorado railway camp, or "The Two Brothers," Sir John and Sir Willie, of the Scottish ballad,<sup>4</sup> became merely "Two Little Boys" in their New World home. To find a piece which might plausibly illustrate the unanimous village throng collaborating on a suitable theme, a composition was chosen which instead of being representative was nearly the only one of its kind to be found by canvassing the whole group.

sition certain negro revival hymns and plantation melodies. "If one will attend a negro revival in the country or suburban districts of the South he can see and hear this process of communal composition, about which so much has been written and surmised." The illustrations cited by Professor Smith are simpler than "The Hangman's Tree." They are songs, not poetical narratives, and they deal with the familiar revival material of the negroes. In general nature, in suitability to the composers and to the occasion, they are much what might be foreseen.

<sup>1</sup> Introduction to *English and Scottish Popular Ballads* (1904), p. xxv.

<sup>2</sup> *The Popular Ballad* (1907), p. 101; also *the Nation*, August 29, 1907; also *Democracy and Poetry* (1911), p. 193.

<sup>3</sup> *The Ballad in Literature* (1912), pp. 72-79.

<sup>4</sup> See note 4 *supra*, p. 198.

We are told that "the ballad genesis is more plainly proved for the Faroes than for any other modern people."<sup>1</sup> But those originated by the Faroe Islanders, when they improvised ballads, seem to be wholly of the expected character and general style. Witness the narrative cited by Professor Gummere of the Faroe fisherman and his boat,<sup>2</sup> or the folk tale of the girl carried off by Frisian pirates.<sup>3</sup> Clearly, like the southwestern cowboys, the Faroe Islanders improvised concerning the events nearest them, and in equally crude style, no doubt. Nor is it proved of these pieces so created that they gained much currency.<sup>4</sup> The best ballads from the Faroes are derived admittedly from Icelandic literary tradition. They tell not of fishermen or girls carried off by pirates but of the deeds of Sigurd. They are pieces of high descent. Similarly with the songs of more contemporary communal creation in modern Europe brought together with painstaking erudition by Professor Gummere.<sup>5</sup> The pieces improvised concern the singers themselves, their own lives and daily work. They are songs rather than ballads, nor is there evidence that they ultimately developed into more elaborate form, or attained higher poetical quality; nor that they gained much diffusion. Like the Faroe pieces, they are on a par with the improvised cowboy songs rather than with the English and Scottish popular ballads. The soldiers who took part in the Battle of Otterbourne may have made their own songs of that battle,<sup>6</sup> but their songs would have had little chance to endure beside those made by the minstrels who are urged to "play up for your warison,"<sup>7</sup> or those from some yet higher source. Once a good one was made, expressing "the mind and heart of the people," much, say, as did

<sup>1</sup> Gummere, *The Popular Ballad* (1907), p. 69. His position is, specifically, that the popular ballad arises from communal beginnings, such as those found among the Faroe Islanders, followed by an "epic development." When, where, or from whom the latter comes, he cannot, or does not, clearly set forth.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 24.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 109, 150, etc.

<sup>4</sup> Accessible in H. Thuren's *Folke Sangen paa Færøerne* (1908). Mr. Henderson remarks of the Faroe fisher ballads that "they are very woeful specimens of verse, of interest only from their touching and almost childish naïveté; and they are not sung to native melodies of ancient fisher tradition or of new fisher improvisation but to lugubrious tunes borrowed, according to Thuren, from Protestant Psalmody."—*The Ballad in Literature*, p. 88.

<sup>5</sup> *The Beginnings of Poetry* (1901), pp. 202 ff.

<sup>6</sup> Gummere, *The Popular Ballad*, p. 235, but see also his admission, p. 260, of minstrel part in the ballad as we have it.

<sup>7</sup> Stanza 43.

the "Marseillaise," "John Brown's Body," "Marching through Georgia," or "Auld Lang Syne," (does it matter much to those who sing these pieces who originally composed them?), public interest in, and memory of, the event and the song would furnish the necessary impetus for diffusion. From this point of view, if songs of the Faroe fisher folk, or of the toiling village throngs of modern Europe, or of the Texas cowboys, throw light on the manner of origin of the English and Scottish popular ballads, they point to a genesis for the latter of some much higher kind.

Nor, if the parallel of the western pieces be still followed out, is the style of expression of the English and Scottish ballads a style which we should expect to find shepherds or plowmen or weavers, "spinsters and knitters in the sun," evolving from crude collaboration. The older the version, the nearer to the original form, the better is the style likely to be. The latter, like the subject-matter, bears the hall mark of a high descent. In the oldest pieces, as "The Battle of Otterbourne," there are phrases and alliterative formulae recalling that fixed poetic vocabulary not used in ordinary speech (*bern, freke, byrd*, etc.) which Dr. Bradley reminds us was characteristic of a group of professional poets about the middle of the fourteenth century.<sup>1</sup> The diction of the older ballads preserves many of the stereotyped alliterative phrases of the metrical romances. To the present writer, another mannerism of ballad expression seems well worthy of attention, in the search for stable testimony as to origins.<sup>2</sup> The liking for "shifted" or "wrenched" accent (*Douglás, Londón, forést*) is familiar to all students of traditional English balladry. For explanation of this it would seem clear that we have to proceed from French loan words, preserving for a while their final accent (*certáyne, countrée, pité, menyé, chambér*), with occasional transfer of this accentuation, through confusion, to native words having properly initial accent<sup>3</sup> (*ladié, daughtér, mornnýge, lesýnge*.)

<sup>1</sup> *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, I, chap. xix.

<sup>2</sup> Even Professor Gummere is troubled by the thought of an aristocratic origin for the ballad stanza, derived almost certainly, it was long believed, from the classical septenarius (*Old English Ballads*, xxx, note 3); but the whole subject of the genesis of the ballad stanza is too dark for very safe inference to be drawn therefrom. See Saintsbury, *History of English Prosody* (1906), for a recent discussion of the origin of the ballad measure.

<sup>3</sup> Some prosodists might hold that these "wrenched accents" are only instances of "pitch accent," and derive them from Old English. Others may feel that they are

The words so stressed were prominent words in the line, were often rhyme words, the most stable words in the stanza; hence the usage established itself as traditional and remained a persistent feature of ballad diction. But the origin of the practice is surely to be found in aristocratic French, not in the vernacular initial accent of the folk. The tradition was more likely to emerge from the rhyme modes of the higher classes, or from a professional singing fraternity, than from humble "spinsters and knitters in the sun." To judge from the character of the stories narrated and the life reflected, perhaps from the general nature of the ballad stanza, and of the expression, the English and Scottish pieces may well have been favored and fostered by the upper classes, as they almost certainly were in Denmark. They might well have been sung in the halls of castles or in the market place with harp accompaniment by accomplished minstrels.<sup>1</sup>

The parallel suggested by the writers quoted at the opening is as interesting as they promised; although conclusions from it, if they are to be made at all, are not to be made hurriedly. It is clear, however, that the better analogy for the Old World pieces is afforded not by those created by the cowboys themselves but by those which have drifted among them and found preservation there.<sup>2</sup> On the whole, if either of the two leading schools of thought

merely crudenesses, made possible by the fact that the ballads were sung not read. But the final accent is too clearly marked, and is used too definitely and too frequently, at least in the earlier pieces, to be explained as something merely casual or fortuitous.

<sup>1</sup> The minstrel of the pre-modern era, that conspicuous figure of the mediaeval world, was a very different figure from the minstrel of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, "ruled out of court" by Professor Kittredge. The latter says: "There is no reason whatever for believing that the state of things between 1300 and 1600 was different [as regards minstrel transmission of ballads] from that between 1600 and 1800—and there are many reasons for believing that it was not different" (Introd. to *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, p. xxiii). But the change from feudal to modern conditions, and especially the introduction of printing, would be quite enough to bring difference in the standing of minstrelsy and in the character of its song.

For the best account of mediaeval minstrels, the higher and the lower orders, the wide scope of their singing, their fondness for dialogue, and the like, see E. K. Chambers, *The Mediaeval Stage*, (1903), I, chaps. iii and iv.

<sup>2</sup> It should not much longer be reiterated, at least without careful definition and restriction to a certain type, that the making of popular ballads is a "closed account." Already there has accumulated in outlying regions a considerable body of American ballads, somehow finding diffusion among the people and preserved in many communities by oral tradition. For a general survey of these, see H. M. Belden, "Balladry in America," in the *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, January-March 1912, and the bibliographical references there. The style of these American pieces is not that of the English and Scottish popular ballads; but that is no more to be expected than that

regarding the origin of the English and Scottish ballads may be said to find support in the testimony of the latter's New World analogues, it is not that school which defines by origin in folk composition, but that which presupposes a higher descent, and defines by style and by destination. In the case of the New World pieces, we are dealing with genuine "humble poetry of simple folk"; in the case of the English and Scottish popular ballads we are dealing with poetry of aristocratic material, having traces blurred by time of an aristocratic manner. Working from both subject-matter and style, it would seem that among the cowboys of the Southwest are reproduced not the conditions which created the English and Scottish popular ballads but rather, it may be, some of the conditions which preserved them.

LOUISE POUND

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

modern book poetry should continue the style of mediaeval book poetry. Surely it should not be said much longer that folk-ballads or traditional ballads, "popular" ballads in the usual sense of that term, are no longer living things; that real folk-ballads are practically extinct. The distinction between "popular," "pure," or "genuine" ballads and "vulgar" ballads, the former ballad type the product of the people in a special sense, under social conditions no longer existing in England or America, the only type of ballad to be claimed for folk-lore, and a type now obsolete; the latter or so-called "vulgar" ballad type written for the people, a low form of "literature" in the usual notation of that term, and not belonging to folk-lore—this distinction, so long insisted upon and held to be of such importance, serving for many as basic in ballad classification, is probably not sound; at least not in so far as it is based on *origin* rather than *style*. It would seem that there need be no difference between the kinds in origin; that one kind does not belong to folk-lore to the exclusion of the other; also that neither, despite the special pleading of Professor Gummere, need represent or be a direct continuant of primitive poetry.





## THOU VACHE

As often as I have read Chaucer's *Truth: Balade de Bon Conseyl*, I have wondered at the supposed jest in the *Envoy*. Why should Chaucer address any man as *Thou vache*? The fact is that there is no joke; the man's name was Sir Philip la Vache, or de la Vache.<sup>1</sup> Association with Chaucer is suggested at once by the fact that he married Elizabeth, the daughter of Chaucer's friend, Sir Lewis Clifford.

References to him are so abundant that it is easy to reconstruct, in large part, his career, to form some idea of his character, and even to give a guess as to the occasion which led Chaucer to write the poem.

The Vache family was connected with Chalfont St. Giles, in Buckinghamshire (later to be associated with Milton), at least as early as 1237 when Ralph de la Vache obtained a tract of twenty acres of land there.<sup>2</sup> He may, of course, have held other lands to which this was merely an addition.<sup>3</sup>

Descended from him and in all probability his son or grandson, was Sir Richard la Vache, or de la Vache, who is frequently mentioned between 1273 and 1309 as a landowner in Buckinghamshire,<sup>4</sup> Chalfont St. Giles itself being named in this connection in 1303.<sup>5</sup>

The first reference to him is in 1265—a "remission" of the King's indignation and rancor by reason of the late disturbance, for trespass committed with several others while they were in the munition at Windsor.<sup>6</sup> This seems to show that Vache had supported Simon de Montfort.

<sup>1</sup> La Vache and De la Vache are the usual forms; but we find "Monsieur Philipp Vach" and "Dame Vache" in the *Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council*, I, 136-37.

<sup>2</sup> *Calendar Close Rolls*, 1234-37, p. 525.

<sup>3</sup> Beltz (*Memorials of the Garter*, 1841, p. 106) says that the Vache family may be "presumed to have been of Gascon origin." It is true that in 1333 one John de la Vacarie is mentioned among merchant vintners of Gascony (*Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1330-34, p. 429); but there is nothing to show that he was related to the Buckinghamshire family, and the name may not have been peculiar to Gascony.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Calendar Close Rolls*, 1272-79, p. 56; and 1279-88, p. 305, where part of Shenley is named; also *Calendar Close Rolls*, 1281-82, p. 80.

<sup>5</sup> *Calendar Charter Rolls*, 1300-26, III, 34. Here "Shenle," "Maunsel," and "Bekenesfeld" are also named.

<sup>6</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1258-66, pp. 461-62.

In 1278, his name occurs in a list of men "bound" to Edmund, Earl of Cornwall—in his case, for 450 marks.<sup>1</sup> As, according to Leland, Berkhamstead, only a few miles from Chalfont St. Giles, belonged to Cornwall, Vache was probably one of his tenants (*Itinerary*, ed. Toulmin-Smith, 1902, I-III, p. 105).

In 1280, Richard Vache owed the Countess of Arundel 300 marks for the custody and marriage of heirs in Maunsel, and was acquitted of that sum.<sup>2</sup>

In 1285 he was one of the attorneys appointed by the Earl of Surrey upon going abroad.<sup>3</sup>

In 1309 he was one of three commissioners in Buckinghamshire appointed to levy a twenty-fifth for the war in Scotland.<sup>4</sup>

His son, Sir Matthew,<sup>5</sup> is often mentioned in the Rolls between 1322 and 1344 as a country gentleman of substance and importance in Buckinghamshire and Hertfordshire.

In 1322 and 1335 he was on tax commissions.<sup>6</sup>

In 1325, he owed £40, to be levied on his lands in Hertfordshire.<sup>7</sup>

In 1328, he and another man owed, curiously enough, a rope-maker of London £300.<sup>8</sup> Possibly the same debt is alluded to, the following year, as due from him to a citizen of London.<sup>9</sup>

The last allusion to him in the Rolls seems to be in a deed of land in 1344, witnessed by him and his son, another Sir Richard.<sup>10</sup>

This younger Sir Richard, the father of Philip, was a prominent figure at the court of Edward III.

The first allusion to him seems to be April 20, 1337, when he obtained letters of protection to go abroad on the King's service with William de Montague, Earl of Salisbury.<sup>11</sup>

This was undoubtedly the embassy which arrived at Valenciennes early in May to make peace with Jacob van Artevelde, headed by the Bishop of Lincoln and the earls of Salisbury and Huntingdon.

<sup>1</sup> *Calendar Close Rolls*, 1272-79, pp. 510-11.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 1279-88, p. 110.

<sup>3</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1281-92, p. 192.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 1307-13, p. 185.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 1361-64, p. 436.

<sup>6</sup> *Calendar Close Rolls*, 1318-23, p. 447; and *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1334-38, p. 132.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 1323-27, p. 349.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 1327-30, p. 421.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 559.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 1343-46, p. 337; and cf. *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1361-64, p. 436, where the three generations are given.

<sup>11</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1334-38, p. 421.

According to Froissart, there were ten "chevaliers bannerets," and forty other knights, "jeunes bacheliers."<sup>1</sup> In all probability Vache was one of the latter.<sup>2</sup>

This same year Vache witnessed a grant of land to Sir John Molyns by the Earl of Huntingdon,<sup>3</sup> and another grant to Molyns by the Earl of Salisbury.<sup>4</sup>

In 1339, he, together with the earls of Salisbury and Northampton and Sir Geoffrey le Scrope, witnessed at Valenciennes a deed of land to Molyns by Sir Walter Manny.<sup>5</sup>

There are various entries of money that this Vache owed: as 1336, £10, due to John Fitz Nichol (*Calendar Close Rolls*, 1333-37, p. 650); 1339, £14, due to Thomas Bonet, brushwood seller of London (*Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1337-39, p. 101); 1345, £100 due to the Earl of Arundel (*Calendar Close Rolls*, 1343-46, p. 588); 1351, £40 due to Thomas de Brembre, clerk (*ibid.*, 1349-54, p. 397). Of money due him, we find mentioned in 1359 a debt of £200 to him and another knight (*ibid.*, 1354-60, p. 625).

In 1338 he was on the list of those receiving a general pardon for offenses against the peace of Edward II and Edward III.<sup>6</sup>

In 1346 he had two pensions of £20 and 20 marks, respectively, for his good service and his "stay with the King."<sup>7</sup>

By this time he was married, as, by his own statement, he had a son born in 1346.<sup>8</sup>

In 1349, Amy de la Vache had a yearly grant of a tun of Gascon wine from Queen Philippa. She was almost certainly his wife, and probably a lady-in-waiting on the Queen.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Buchon, I, chap. LVIII, p. 57. See also *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1334-38, pp. 420-21.

<sup>2</sup> In the Shenley dispute in 1283-84, his grandfather is called Sir Richard de la Vache, the elder (*Calendar Close Rolls*, 1279-88, p. 305), which at first glance suggests that the second Richard was born before that time. He would then have been fifty-three or fifty-four years old when he is first mentioned in connection with the Valenciennes embassy, and, later, would have been given important offices when he was nearly eighty. This is not impossible; but, on the other hand, there may have been an intermediate Richard, brother of Matthew, and uncle of the younger Richard.

<sup>3</sup> *Calendar Close Rolls*, 1333-37, p. 259.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 1337-39, p. 286.

<sup>5</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1338-40, pp. 395, 409-10. Molyns, who was made keeper of the king's hawks in 1338 (*ibid.*, 1338-40, p. 47), was a neighbor of Vache's and probably related to the family, but I have not been able to determine the relationship.

<sup>6</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1338-40, p. 159.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 1345-48, pp. 157, 445.

<sup>8</sup> *Calendar of Papal Registers, Petitions*, I, 1342-1419, p. 334.

<sup>9</sup> Belz, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

In 1352, he was sent on the King's service, "for the safeguarding of the King's shipping and merchants on the sea."<sup>1</sup>

In 1354 and 1356, he was on commissions of *oyer and terminer* in Buckinghamshire.<sup>2</sup>

In 1355, he was made Knight of the Garter, in the place of Lord de Lisle;<sup>3</sup> and upon his death was succeeded by Henry Percy, the first earl of Northumberland.

March 5, 1356, that is, some months before the battle of Poitiers, he was granted 100 marks "for good service in the strenuous bearing of the King's standard in his wars." This was in addition to the 50 marks lately granted him for life, or until he had an equivalent of land or rent.<sup>4</sup>

This entry shows that he was distinguished for his courage, and suggests that he was ambitious to increase his estates in the country. In 1361, he acquired the manor of Asshyndon or Asshedon (Bucks.) for life, at a rent of one rose at midsummer, for the first seven years, £20 a year for the next three, and after that, £60 a year during the grantor's life.<sup>5</sup> The peculiar terms of the grant perhaps mean that a good deal of money needed to be spent on the property before it would yield returns.

In 1363, he acquired seemingly about half of the manor of Chalfont St. Giles, in which he had previously owned some land.<sup>6</sup>

Meanwhile he was made Constable of the Tower for life, January 26, 1361,<sup>7</sup> and held this office until his death.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1350-54, p. 240.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 1354-58, pp. 124, 455, 498.

<sup>3</sup> *Beltz*, *op. cit.*, pp. 106-7.

<sup>4</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1354-58, pp. 360-61. The changes in the form of the annuity are curious. In 1348, his 50 marks were paid out of the farm of the alien priory of St. Nicholas-lez-Angers, in Buckinghamshire—doubtless a convenient point for receiving them (*ibid.*, 1348-50, p. 195). In 1356, his 100 marks he asks to have paid thus: £59 from the priory of Neuton Lungevill and 11 marks 6s. 8d. from St. Nicholas (*ibid.*, 1354-58, p. 434). In 1358, his grants are summed up as worth £100 a year and settled as follows: the castle of Bolsovre (Derby), worth £40 a year; £10 from the farm of William Bohun, Earl of Northampton, and £50 at the Exchequer (*ibid.*, 1358-61, p. 42). Possibly this partition was for convenience in changes of residence. In 1359, when he was keeper of Clipston (see below), his fee of £10 12s. 11d., and £50 of his annuity were exchanged for the manor "Mammesfeld" (Nottinghamshire), which came into the King's hands upon the death of the queen-mother, Isabel, and which was rated at £60 a year (*Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1358-61, p. 209).

<sup>5</sup> *Calendar Close Rolls*, 1360-64, pp. 265, 276.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 549-50, 552-53.

<sup>7</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1358-61, p. 531.

<sup>8</sup> He is mentioned as in office December 29, 1365 (*Calendar Close Rolls*, 1364-68, p. 209), and he was dead before January 21, 1366.

His deputy was one Thomas la Vache; but there is no indication as to the relation-

May 23, 1358, he was given for life the bailiwick of the stewardship of Shirewod (Sherwood) Forest with the keeping of the manor and park of Clipston and of hays in the forest, together with windfalls, chiminages, expeditation of dogs, agistments, pannages, and other profits.<sup>1</sup>

In 1363, he is called chief forester of Sherwood.<sup>2</sup>

Before September 24, 1361, he was made constable of Windsor Castle and keeper of the royal park at Windsor.<sup>3</sup> In connection with this office the Rolls mention, July 10, 1362, an interesting custom dating from the time of Henry II, by which he or his men were bound to deliver to the prior and convent of St. Peter at Westminster, on the eve of St. Peter's Chains, eight bucks and two harts, and to wind their horns twice before the high altar at Westminster.<sup>4</sup>

October 10, 1363, he received a pardon for all trespasses of vert and venison committed by himself or others in his service.<sup>5</sup>

November 20, 1363, he went abroad on the King's service,<sup>6</sup> and ten days later he was made exempt for life from service on assizes and similar duties.<sup>7</sup>

He died in January, 1366. According to the *Inquisitiones post mortem*,<sup>8</sup> he was seised of Maunsfeld, and of lands in Sutton, Carleton, and Lyndeby in Nottinghamshire; but the list is manifestly incomplete. His chief holdings were in four other counties: Buckingham, Oxford, Cambridge, and Hertford.

Like Chaucer's father, Sir Richard la Vache was of the Court, but he was a person of much more importance. He began his career as a soldier, and gradually acquired the estates and the standing of a country gentleman. John Chaucer began life as a citizen and accumulated land and tenements in London. He did not attain knighthood, or seemingly aspire to country estates. Vache, on the other hand, although he owned a little property in Broad Street<sup>9</sup>—possibly

ship of the two men (*ibid.*, pp. 152, 156, and 1361-64, p. 547). A Walter de la Vache is also mentioned as one of the King's yeomen (*Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1354-58, p. 632); but his relationship to the others does not appear.

<sup>1</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1361-64, p. 274.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 315.

<sup>3</sup> *Calendar Close Rolls*, 1360-64, p. 214.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 349.

<sup>5</sup> *Calendar Close Rolls*, p. 403.

<sup>6</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, p. 424.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 432.

<sup>8</sup> II, p. 277.

<sup>9</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1361-64, p. 518, and 1364-67, p. 335.

merely a town house—must have spent most of his later years in the country.

The first allusion to Philip la Vache is in 1358 when Sir Richard petitioned the Pope on behalf of his son, Philip la Vache, aged twelve, for a benefice of the value of £30 in the gift of the Bishop of Lincoln.<sup>1</sup> The petition was granted.

January 21, 1366, he became the ward of William de Wykeham, described as "the King's clerk," who was given the wardship of his lands in Buckingham and Cambridge, said to be held in chief, and the marriage of the heir.<sup>2</sup>

July 16, 1366, Philip la Vache, "chevalier," went beyond the seas by the King's license.<sup>3</sup>

In 1370 he was said to have "proved his age," and so became seised of his father's estates.<sup>4</sup>

It is curious that he should have gone abroad immediately after his father's death, and only a few months before he himself came of age, thus leaving his lands almost four years in wardship. Whether he was fighting in the Far East, or for some other reason unable to return, or whether his father, in 1358, to make sure of the benefice, had represented him as several years older than he was, is a matter for speculation.

May 8, 1374, he received a gift of 50 marks from John of Gaunt, Clifford himself being entered for twice as much.<sup>5</sup>

In 1375, he was associated with Sir Philip de Courtenay, the admiral of the fleet in the West, in the "gift and sale" of the marriage of a ward to "Dame Alice Perriers."<sup>6</sup>

Like Chaucer, he began his career as a soldier. In 1376, he and Sir John Harleston, then captain of Guines, were associated in the

<sup>1</sup> *Calendar Papal Registers, Petitions*, I, 1342-1419, p. 334. At the same time he asked for a benefice, value £40, in the gift of the Bishop of Salisbury, for his son Edward, aged eleven, which was also granted. In 1361, he asked for a canonry at Lincoln with the expectation of a prebend, for Edward, then said to be thirteen (*ibid.*, p. 371), which was granted. I have found no further mention of this Edward.

<sup>2</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1364-67, p. 196. He also witnesses a large grant of land to Wykeham, July 4, 1375 (*Calendar Close Rolls*, 1374-77, pp. 244-45).

<sup>3</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1364-67, p. 298. He had letters of attorney for three persons. One of them was William Strete, whose name was later associated with Vache's in an affair which may have been the cause of the "wretchedness" alluded to by Chaucer in the poem. See p. 17, below.

<sup>4</sup> *Calendar Close Rolls*, 1369-74, p. 157.

<sup>5</sup> *John of Gaunt's Register*, 1911, No. 1, 429.

<sup>6</sup> *Calendar Close Rolls*, 1374-77, p. 280.



capture of two distinguished French prisoners whose ransoms were £1500 and £1000 respectively.<sup>1</sup>

This same year he and Nicholas or Collard Dabrichecourt lent Sir Philip le Spenser 1,000 marks, which were duly repaid.<sup>2</sup>

He was also associated in 1376 with Sir Thomas Moryeux, Sir William Beauchamp, and others in a mainprise of £200 for a case of trespass.<sup>3</sup>

He was made a Knight of the Chamber at the close of Edward III's reign (September 30, 48th year);<sup>4</sup> and was a witness early in the reign of Richard to tell what he knew about Alice Perrers in the case of Richard Lyons. He declared that he was summoned to the King's chamber at Shene "to hear what ought to be done; and when he heard the matter, he would not stay, but went forth out of the chamber."<sup>5</sup>

His office as Knight of the Chamber was confirmed by Richard II, February 3, 1378, with a grant of £50 payable at the Exchequer.<sup>6</sup> This was only about a month before similar grants were confirmed to Chaucer and his wife.<sup>7</sup>

Little more than a month after Nicholas Brembre and John Philpot were associated with Chaucer in the customs work, they with Hadley and Walworth (Walworth and Brembre had been with Chaucer in 1374-75) raised a loan of £5,000 for the King, for which he pledged some of the royal plate and crown jewels. Of these things, three large golden crowns with rubies (baleis), diamonds, sapphires, and other stones, and pearls, were in the keeping of M. Philip la Vache.<sup>8</sup> This fact shows to what extent he was trusted by the King.

Before this time, he had been made keeper of the royal manor and park of Woodstock; and April 25, 1379, this office was extended

<sup>1</sup> Rymer, *Foedera*, 1727, VII, 103; and *Calendar Close Rolls*, 1374-77, p. 316.

<sup>2</sup> *Calendar Close Rolls*, 1374-77, p. 322.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 337.

<sup>4</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1377-81, p. 104.

<sup>5</sup> *Rolls of Parliament*, III, 13.

<sup>6</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1377-81, p. 104. Later, exchanged for £50 a year out of the issues of Buckingham and Oxford (August 28, 10th R. II). This was probably for convenience, as he lived much in the country (*Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1385-89, p. 221).

<sup>7</sup> *Life Records*, 213-14.

<sup>8</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1377-81, p. 25. Here only two are mentioned. They are, however, described in a document published by Rymer (VII, 187-88) as: "la meilloure corone; la corone de Spaigne; la tierce meilloure corone"; i.e., they were the official crowns, not mere diadems. In this document (March 19, 1378) Vache is said to be the guardian of certain gold vessels.

for life at a yearly rental of £127 16s. 6d. at which it was granted October 7, 50th Edward III (1376), and confirmed February 3, 1st Richard II (1378), although investigation had shown that it was then worth £216 17s. a year.<sup>1</sup> If this valuation is right, Vache must have cleared almost £100 a year out of this grant alone.

Before this time he had married Elizabeth Clifford, as July 2, 1380, William of Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester, paid 40s. for a license permitting James de Beel, a merchant of Lucca, and Amice, his wife, to grant to himself and eight others (one of whom was Walworth) the reversion, in fee, of a moiety of the manor of Combe Byset, Wiltshire, after the death of Elizabeth, wife of Philip la Vache, Knight, they being her tenants for life.<sup>2</sup>

Elizabeth la Vache also held the manor of Hognorton in chief, after William Molyns, Knight, who was dead August 11, 1382.<sup>3</sup> Evidently an attempt was made to get this land away from the Vaches, for under the date just given is recorded a pardon to William Nafferton and three others for obtaining the reversion of it from Molyns without the royal license, and permission to grant the reversion to John de Harleston, Richard Abberbury, and others. Harleston was Vache's old companion in arms, and he was repeatedly associated with Abberbury (also spelled Adderbury).<sup>4</sup>

Lady Vache evidently held a good deal of property in her own right. Besides her share of Combe Byset, and the manor of Hognorton,<sup>5</sup> she held also land at Great Mussenden (Bucks.) worth 16 marks 12d. a year.<sup>6</sup>

In 1399, her father, with three others, granted to her and her husband the manor of Bury, in Chalfont St. Giles, in fee tail, with remainder to their heirs.<sup>7</sup> It is interesting to note that the reversion was assigned next to Thomas Percy, Earl of Worcester, with whom Chaucer went on a mission to Flanders in 1377; to Sir Thomas

<sup>1</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1377-81, p. 341.    <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 526.    <sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 1381-85, p. 162.

<sup>4</sup> Abberbury, at this very time, was Justice of the Peace for Oxford with Vache (*Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1381-85, pp. 140, 195, 247); in 1395, he was associated with Vache in the wardship of the heir and lands of John Fitz Elyz (*ibid.*, 1391-96, p. 1594); 1397, he was associated with Vache and William Willcotes in the acquisition of a manor in Gloucestershire (*ibid.*, 1396-99, p. 136); in 1397, also, he and Vache with several others audited the accounts of the King's clerk who had collected the moneys due to Queen Anne at the time of her death (*ibid.*, 1396-99, pp. 245, 518).

<sup>5</sup> *Descriptive Catalogue of Ancient Deeds*, III, D, 977, p. 520.

<sup>6</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1381-85, p. 264.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 1396-99, p. 553.

Blount, and to Sir Thomas Clanevowe, to whom with Vache and Sir John Cheney, Clifford willed most of his property.<sup>1</sup> Clanevowe was also one of the supervisors of Vache's will.<sup>2</sup>

It was doubtless on Lady Vache's account that in 1393 Clifford had enfeoffed Vache together with the Earl of Salisbury, Cheney, and one other in the Welsh castle and property of Ewyas Harald.<sup>3</sup>

In addition to the keepership of Woodstock, Vache was appointed for life, October 1, 1383, keeper of the King's manor and park of Chiltern (later, King's) Langley.<sup>4</sup> He succeeded William Strete, whom he had made one of his attorneys in 1366. In connection with this appointment, we find the first and last misfortune of which mention has survived in his career. October 20, 1386, he surrendered the office, here described as worth 4*d.* a day, but doubtless worth very much more through perquisites, to Thomas Atte Lee, one of the King's squires.<sup>5</sup> A reason for his surrender is suggested in the fact that September 26, 1387, a commission of four was appointed to inquire into damages done to the park in the time of Vache and Strete, "farmers" thereof.<sup>6</sup> Exactly a week later, October 3, 1387, Vache's name was added to the list of commissioners, and Strete alone was held responsible for the damages.<sup>7</sup>

That this was in large part, if not entirely, true is shown by the facts that Strete had held the office for ten years until he died,<sup>8</sup> while Vache had been in office only a few months when an earlier commission was appointed, February 12, 1384, "to enquire touching waste and dilapidations in the King's manor, granges, mills, and park of Childernelangele, co. Hertford, in the time of William Strete, late keeper thereof."<sup>9</sup>

For whatever reasons Vache resigned in 1386, he seems not to have done so willingly, because, although John Peytevyne was appointed in 1391 to take the place of Atte Lee, and he was followed December 12, 1392, by Henry Norton, both squires of the King's Chamber,<sup>10</sup> the

<sup>1</sup> *Scrope-Grosvenor Rolls*, II, 431.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 13, below.

<sup>3</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1391-96, p. 227. In 1400 this was transferred to Chaucer's friend, Sir William Beauchamp (*Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1399-1401, pp. 204, 220).

<sup>4</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1381-85, p. 311.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 390.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 1385-89, p. 234.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 1377-81, p. 277.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 1385-89, p. 388.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 1381-85, p. 420.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 1388-92, p. 446, and *ibid.*, 1391-96, pp. 202-3.

latter, May 5, 1396, vacated the office to Vache whom, it was said, the King had appointed in 1383, for life;<sup>1</sup> and Vache held it thenceforward until his death. It was given June 9, 1408, to Richard Hay, one of the King's squires, "with the fees and wages pertaining to it and the herbage of the park, not exceeding the value of £10 yearly, as Philip la Vache, 'chivaler,' deceased, had."<sup>2</sup>

Undoubtedly the place was worth much more than the £6 a year at which it was valued when Vache was appointed, or the £10 a year at which it was rated when he died.<sup>3</sup> Then why did Vache resign? From the date of his appointment on the commission, October 3, 1387, I have found no further mention of him until April 2, 1390, when he was sent on an embassy to treat of peace with France, being at that time captain of one of the King's forts in Picardy.<sup>4</sup> From this it seems clear that he lived abroad for several years—at least between May 15, 1388, and April 8, 1390, even if he did not go earlier. November 8, 1388, his name is on the list of the captains in Picardy who were allowed to send oxen and sheep taken from the French to be fattened in England and returned without duty.<sup>5</sup>

The simplest interpretation I can find for these facts is that Vache because of his intimate association with the King was not sorry to have a post abroad during Gloucester's period of control, which began October, 1386, the very month of his resignation<sup>6</sup> and lasted until May, 1389, when Richard suddenly took the control of affairs. Whether he went abroad immediately, and a year later had his name

<sup>1</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1405-8, p. 442.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Strete was given the use of the lodge called "Little London" within the park, and a tun of Gascon wine yearly, or its value in money, the wine, however, not being included when the grant was confirmed by Richard II (*Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1377-81, p. 277). Peytevyne was allowed the mills and other profits except the conies which were reserved for the use of the royal household, and he was expected to turn in 50 marks a year rent (*ibid.*, 1388-92, pp. 446, 457).

<sup>4</sup> This was certainly not Calais as Beltz says, deriving his information from Rot. Franc. 11 R. II, m. 5, 14 R. II, m. 2, and 15 R. II, m. 5, as, according to the numerous references in the Rolls, Sir William Beauchamp held that post 1384-92; and in a document dated November 8, 1388, published by Rymer (*Foedera*, VII, 607), he is described as "Philippus la Vache, capitaneus castri nostri . . ."; that is, a blank is left for the name of the town, and Beauchamp is said to be captain of Calais (*ibid.*, VII, 648-49, and *passim*). Beltz, on the same authority, 17 Ric. II, m. 13, says that in 1393 Vache was captain of Guines; but this is again an error, as Thomas Swynburn is so described in the Rolls between May 24, 1391, and November 13, 1394.

<sup>5</sup> Rymer, VII, 607-8.

<sup>6</sup> It is worth while to note in this connection that Chaucer resigned both his offices only two months later.

added to the list of commissioners without actually serving, as a means of stopping inquiry as to his share of the blame in regard to Chiltern Langley, or whether he actually served on this commission, I have no evidence to show. His appointment as commissioner seems to me unmistakably intended to disassociate him from the mismanagement. Certainly these years were for him a time of eclipse. Until 1386 he prospered; between 1390 and 1399, he grew steadily in honor and in wealth; between 1387 and 1390 all that we know of him is that he held a foreign post.<sup>1</sup>

From this time on, Vache's prosperity was assured. April 14, 1394, he was retained for life at a salary of 100 marks a year in addition to his other perquisites.<sup>2</sup>

In September, 1394, he had letters of protection to go to Ireland with the King.<sup>3</sup>

In November he brought a special message from the King in Ireland to the Council,<sup>4</sup> and in February 11, 1395, he appointed Clifford one of his attorneys as he expected to be a year in Ireland.<sup>5</sup>

July 20, 1395, he was associated with the Chief Justice of the Common Bench and several other persons to receive in the King's name a recognizance for a fine of £20,000 to be paid to the King by the mayor and commonalty of Salisbury.<sup>6</sup>

January 2, 1396, he shared with Margery, Lady Molyns, the goods of John James Wotton forfeited for debt.<sup>7</sup>

In 1399, he was made Knight of the Garter and given the stall of none other than John of Gaunt himself,<sup>8</sup> thus following not only his father, but his father-in-law, Clifford, who in 1398 had succeeded

<sup>1</sup> When the Bill of Appeal for treason against Gloucester and his friends was brought up in Parliament, September, 1397, by the King's brothers and intimate friends, four knights made themselves pledges for its prosecution. These were Sir Simon Felbrigg, Sir Philip la Vache, Sir John Littlebury, and Sir Baldwin Bereford, all Knights of the King's Chamber, and his beneficiaries by many grants. This action certainly suggests partisanship against the friends of Gloucester and intimacy with the King (*Rolls of Parl.*, III, 374).

<sup>2</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1391-96, p. 404.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 474.

<sup>4</sup> *Acts of the Privy Council*, I, 52.

<sup>5</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1391-96, p. 533.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 651.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 1396-99, p. 49. The phrase "the King's Knight" used of him here seems to mean no more than Knight of the King's Chamber. It is used of various others, including Clifford, so that it cannot have, as Sir Harris Nicolas seemed to imply in speaking of Clifford (*Scrope-Grosvenor Rolls*, II, 430), a special significance.

<sup>8</sup> Beltz, *op. cit.*, p. 374.

to the stall of Ingelram de Coucy, the Duke of Bedford. Thus Vache had the stall of King Richard's uncle; and Clifford, that of his uncle by marriage.

At this time he was chamberlain of the household of the child-queen Isabel. A document, dated July 12, 1399, commands him, with Hugh le Despenser, and other officers of her household, to obey William le Scrope, the Earl of Wiltshire, and the knights Bussy, Grene, and Bagot, to whom was then granted the keepership of Wallingford Castle.<sup>1</sup> He is called her chamberlain in a document of Henry IV, July 13, 1400, excusing him from attendance on the King in Scotland on that ground, and in June, 1401,<sup>2</sup> he was of the convoy that escorted the Queen to Calais, while "Dame Vache" was one of the four ladies attending her.<sup>3</sup>

October 16, 1399, he was confirmed in the keepership of the park and manor of Woodstock and of Chiltern Langley, and also of the manor, park, and lodge of Berkle (co. Oxford)—an office not mentioned before in the Rolls. This had come to him through the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Earl of Rutland to whom, November 18, 1397, Richard had granted all the lands of Queen Anne, and for it he paid a farm of 50 marks<sup>4</sup> a year.

At this time he must have had an income of some hundreds of pounds from his offices, his annuity, and the revenues from his own lands; but apparently he was not yet content.

February 20, 1400, he obtained a share in the manor of Sutton Valence, Kent.<sup>5</sup>

December 7, 1405, he obtained a confirmation of his annuity (18th R. II) and the payment of arrears.<sup>6</sup>

During the first part of Henry's reign, he seems to have been in active service, though there is no sign of any very close connection with the Court. August 27, 1400, he was licensed to take bucks for the royal household from various parks and forests.<sup>7</sup> In 1403, he served (July 14) on commissions of *oyer and terminer* and (September 16) of array, in Oxfordshire, Hertfordshire, and Buckinghamshire.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1396-99, p. 588.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 1399-1401, p. 323.

<sup>3</sup> *Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council*, I, 136-37.

<sup>4</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1399-1401, p. 17.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 207.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 1405-8, p. 106.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 1399-1401, p. 335.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 1401-5, pp. 283, 285.



That he was living at this time the life of a country gentleman is suggested by the following document, dated September 7, 1403. It states that he is to be exempt from assizes, juries, inquisitions, attaints, or recognitions, and from being made mayor, sheriff, escheator, coroner, knight of the shire, justice of the peace, collector, taxer, assessor, surveyor or controller of tenths, fifteenths or other subsidies, leader, trier, or arrayer of men at arms, hobelers, or archers, or commissioner, inquisitor, officer, minister or bailiff of the King, and grants in consideration of his old age and debility, that he shall not be compelled to go to any parts of the realm by reason of any grant of Edward III, Richard II, or the King of lands, offices, bailiwicks, annuities, and fees or force of any statute, proclamation or command of the King.<sup>1</sup>

Although he was only fifty-seven years old, or possibly even less, the change in the royal line probably caused him to retire early. These exemptions, never so numerous as between 1399 and 1408, include many names of Richard's courtiers.

In Clifford's will (September 17, 1404) Vache is mentioned as follows:

"Now first I bequethe to Sire Philype la Vache, Knight, my masse-booke, and my porhoos; and my book of Tribulacion to my daughter hys wyf."

The will continues in Latin:

"Et quicquid residuum fuerit omnium et singulorum bonorum et catalorum superius neu inferius legatorum, do integre et lego Philippo la Vache Johanni Cheynne et Thomæ Clanvow militibus libere sibi possidendum," etc.<sup>2</sup>

Vache's relations with Clifford seem to have been friendly throughout, as is evinced by the various earlier deeds of land from Clifford, as well as by the terms in which he is mentioned in the will itself.

His will, dated April 25, 1407,<sup>3</sup> is a ponderous document which throws some light on his character and much on his wealth.

After the usual opening form, he states he wished to be buried in the church of St. Giles at Chalfont. He then refers to another

<sup>1</sup> *Calendar Patent Rolls, 1401-5*, p. 256.

<sup>2</sup> *Scrope-Grosvenor Rolls, II*, 431.

<sup>3</sup> *Prerog. Court of Canterbury, Register Marche*, fols. 16-17.

document in which he had arranged that his lands should be sold and their profits used for carrying out his will.

He requests that a black cloth be placed on his body and five tapers be set around it in honor of the five wounds of Christ.

He asks that 1,000 paupers, those who are most needy, should have each 4*d.* of his alms, as quickly as it could be given.

He leaves 10 marks for the fabric of the church of St. Giles at Chalfont, and asks that each of his servants not named in the will should be rewarded by his executors and supervisors.

He leaves his wife 36 silver dishes, 12 silver salt cellars, 6 silver chargers, 4 silver jars each measuring a pottle, and 2 each measuring a quart. He also leaves her a little silver jar standing on three lions (his coat-of-arms was three lions) with its pedestal. He leaves her also 24 silver spoons and 12 silver-gilt goblets with covers, and two goblets with covers, one of gold which was given by Isabella, recently queen of England, and another which was given on their wedding day by Joan, Princess of Wales.<sup>1</sup> He leaves her also 6 plain silver goblets with covers, and two silver basins marked with the cow's foot (his crest) with their two ewers (i.e., for the hand-washing at meals), and a round silver basin and its ewer, 2 silver salt cellars and 4 silver candelabra, a new missal, a silver chalice and patena, 2 silver cruets, a silver pax, and two suits of vestments with all the ornaments of the chapel.

He leaves her also each and all of his beds, sheets, coverlets, carpets, pillows, feather beds, and all embroidered feather cushions, with all the furnishings of his chamber or chambers except one bed of silk embroidered with knots; all his napery which belongs to the pantry and the buttery; and all other utensils which belong to these offices, together with utensils of lead, pewter, brass, and iron for the use of the kitchen and brewery; also all his gems and jewels and whatsoever articles of personal adornment are now in his or her possession.

He leaves her also all his two-wheeled carts (*carrectas*), with all the horses and harness belonging to them; all the *culturam terre mee vesturamque*; all his rams and ewes and lambs which are feeding in the manor of La Vache, all the bullocks and cows

<sup>1</sup> This probably because Sir Lewis Clifford was one of her special knights.

of his "deierie," all the swine, sows, and little pigs at La Vache, his carriage (*currum*) with its horses, cushions, carpets, and all its furnishings; all the furniture of his hall with its carpets, cushions, and everything else that belongs to it.

To Alice Spigranell, who now has two pensions for life of 4 marks and 6 marks, respectively, he gives the choice of continuing these and of relinquishing them for £40 to be paid within a half-year of his death.

He then makes provision for four women and two men, seemingly servants; provides for prayers for his soul, his wife's, his parents'; provides for poor tenants out of a possible residue; provides for the return of such *carte*, *finis*, and *munimenta* as are now in his hands, to their rightful owners.

He leaves 40s. to a tenant named Rydyng, and 46s. 8d. to be distributed "pro anima domini Guychard Dangle."

He forgives a debt of 1,000 marks to Sir William Molyns and he forgives William Alberd a *statutum* in his custody.

He names nine executors,<sup>1</sup> apparently clerks and chaplains; and three supervisors, his wife, Thomas Clanvowe, and Edmund Hamden. To each of his *ministrators* (=executors?) he leaves 10 marks for his trouble.

The will was probated, June 22, 1408.

Among the curious things about this will, not the least singular are the facts that there is no statement of the money returns from the sale of his lands, or indeed of any considerable sum of money at all; and there is no mention of his daughter Blanche,<sup>2</sup> who had married Richard, Lord Grey de Wilton.

The best explanation I can suggest from the facts at hand is that the bulk of the land had gone with Blanche as her dower and was now in her husband's possession, Blanche herself being dead at this time. In support of this, we find that Shenley was owned by Richard Grey de Wilton when he died in 1442,<sup>3</sup> and also that "Shenley alias le Vaches" belonged to Margaret, the wife of Richard Grey de Wilton, when she died in 1452.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Among his executors was one John Skreuan. As this name with its variants, *Scriveyn*(e), *Skryteyn*(e), *Screyeen*, etc., is not uncommon, Professor Manly suggests that "Adam Scriveyn" may possibly have been the actual name of Chaucer's scribe.

<sup>2</sup> Beltz, *op. cit.*, p. 376.

<sup>3</sup> *Calendar Inquisit. post mortem*, IV, 208.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 251.

The amount of silver owned by Vache was quite extraordinary for that time; and all the other details suggest that he lived expensively.

He seems to have had less personal vanity than many of his rich contemporaries who in their wills went into great detail about their clothes and ornaments.

Why he should have been so concerned about the soul of Sir Guichard d'Angle, King Richard's military tutor, then dead twenty-seven years, I cannot in the least explain.

Sir Philip's arms were a modification of his father's, and are described by Beltz (*op. cit.*, p. 376) as follows:

Arms

Gules, 3 lions rampant, Argent, crowned Or.

Crest

A cow's foot embowed. Ermine, hoof Or.

Let us interpret the poem in the light of these facts:

Flee from the crowd (who knew it better than this courtier of many years?) and dwell with truth, and be content with what you have (surely he had enough!); for hoarded wealth brings hate, and climbing is dangerous; there is envy among the crowd, and wealth blinds everywhere. (What could describe and explain more exactly Vache's situation in 1386 and 1387, when he was criticized for mismanagement, and finally resigned one of his offices?) Don't try to enjoy more than you ought to have (for instance, don't grieve over the loss of Chiltern Langley). Do what is right so that you can counsel other folk, and truth shall prevail (if Strete was at fault, you will be cleared).

Don't make a stir to redress all that is crooked (as, for instance, Gloucester's usurpation of power), trusting in fickle Fortune. There is great rest in few obligations. Be careful not to scorn what you have because you can't have everything (or you may lose it all; i.e., if you take action for your rights, you may fare worse, and lose what you still have). Strive not as the crook with the wall (i.e., don't ruin yourself by being rash when you have no chance). Conquer yourself as you conquer others; and truth shall prevail.

Take meekly what is sent to you; wrestling for (the honors of) the world invites a fall. You are only a pilgrim in the wilderness of this world; go forth, beast, out of your stall (i.e., you who have the crest of the cow's hoof, and you who live at La Vache), and let your spirit lead you to your true home in heaven.

Then comes the special application:

Therefore, Vache, leave your old wretchedness; cease to be a slave to the world. Pray to God and He will reward you, and truth shall prevail.

Old wretchedness suggests that the lines were written sometime after Vache's troubles began; but it is impossible to define the date more closely than as probably between 1386 and 1390.

It has seemed worth while to give a detailed account of the man whom Chaucer addresses as, "Thou, Vache," in this intimate little poem. It is clear that he was neither citizen nor scholar, but, like his forefathers, primarily a country gentleman, yet not averse to the offices and perquisites to be had at Court. But most of his life centered about La Vache, which seems to have been at Shenley, and Chalfont St. Giles; the royal estates that he managed were chiefly within ten miles, hence easily reached in a few hours.

He was something of a soldier, probably a polished gentleman, and, it is safe to assume from the positions that he held, good company. He shows no trace of Clifford's leaning toward the Lollards.

The description of his household effects suggests that he was given to lavish hospitality. Did Chaucer perhaps borrow this feature for his picture of the Franklin?

To lyven in delit was ever his wone,  
For he was Epicurus owene sone,

and

An housholdere, and that a greet, was he:  
Seint Julian was he in his contree.

Moreover, the Franklin held such offices as are mentioned in Vache's exemption; and certainly Vache was a *vavasour*.

More light on Vache's relations with Chaucer may appear when all the Rolls are published. Meanwhile, his identification emphasizes the poet's connection with the Cliffords. It further suggests that Chaucer's work may be at many points more closely related to his life than has been supposed. I believe that a constant sifting of biographical and historical records of all kinds may throw considerable light on the originals of the Pilgrims, and on Chaucer's methods of dealing with his material.

For instance, I hope soon to show how the Reeve came into his life, and why the poet made him live by Baldeswelle.

EDITH RICKERT

#### NOTE ON THE ENVOY OF *TRUTH*

Miss Rickert's discovery—the validity of which is hardly open to question—incidentally disposes of two problems connected with the Envoy of this poem.

Several scholars have expressed doubts of its authorship, as it is contained in only one MS (see references in Miss Hammond's *Manual*). But Chaucer's relations to Vache were such as to make his authorship highly probable; and the Envoy is closely bound to the poem by "beste" (l. 18), which obviously is not due to a vague suggestion from Boethius (see Skeat's note), but is a definite anticipation of "Vache" of the Envoy.

Shirley calls the poem a "Balade that Chaucier made on his deethbedde." This statement has long been recognized as improbable. That Shirley knew little about the poem is indicated by the absence of the Envoy from the two copies made by him. The improbability of a death-bed composition is perhaps increased by the presence of the pun on Vache's name.

Is there any instance in which information given by Shirley has, when tested, proved to be correct? It may fairly be doubted, I think, whether he possessed any information not derived from the poems or any authoritative traditions.

JOHN M. MANLY

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



## NOTES ON CHAUCER

### I. "A CAVE UNDER A ROCK Y-GRAVE"

Ten Brink has shown that Chaucer in writing the story of Ceys and Aleyone in the *Book of the Duchess* drew material both from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Book xi, ll. 410-748, and Machaut's *Dit de la Fontaine Amoureuse*.<sup>1</sup> In his discussion ten Brink makes the statement that in referring to the dwelling of the god of sleep Chaucer combines descriptions given by Ovid and Machaut. Though this is true, it involves a question concerning the reading of Chaucer's MS of Ovid. Lines 155-56 are from Machaut:

Til he com to the derke valeye  
That stant betwene rockes tweye.

The description taken from Ovid is in lines 163-64:

. . . . a cave  
That was under a rokke y-grave.

This *cave under a rock* depends upon a variation in the texts of Ovid. The line from which this is taken reads:

Tecta petit iussi sub rupe latentia regis.  
—*Met.* xi. 591.

Most modern texts read *sub nube* instead of *sub rupe*. But as evidence that some of the MSS read *sub rupe*, I quote the following note from Heinsius: "*sub nube latentia*] De nube nugae sunt. Scribe sub rupe cum primo Gronovii, quarto Mediceo, Rottendorph. Graeviano et aliis duobus: fec. Pal. et duo alii, *sub nocte*: frustra."<sup>2</sup> Clearly Chaucer's MS read *sub rupe*.

### II. BUSIRIS IN THE MONK'S TALE

In the story of Hercules in the *Monk's Tale* (ll. 113-14) Chaucer has confused the two episodes of Busiris and Diomedes. Professor Skeat<sup>3</sup> explains the confusion as follows:

<sup>1</sup>Ten Brink, *Chaucer Studien*, pp. 7-12.

<sup>2</sup>Nic. Heinsii commentarius in P. Ovidii Nasonis opera omnia, ed. Joh. Masson, 1758, p. 665.

<sup>3</sup>Skeat, *Oxford Chaucer*, V, 232.

Here Chaucer has confused two stories. One is that Busiris, a king of Egypt, used to sacrifice all foreigners who came to Egypt, till the arrival of Hercules, who slew him. The other is "the eighth labour," when Hercules killed Diomedes, a king in Thrace, who fed his mares with human flesh, till Hercules slew him and gave his body to be eaten by the mares, as Chaucer *himself* says in his translation. The confusion was easy, because the story of Busiris is mentioned elsewhere by Boethius, Bk. II, pr. 6, in a passage which Chaucer thus translates: "I have herd told of Busirides, that was wont to sleen his gastes that herberweden in his hous; and he was sleyn himself of Ercules that was his gest."

This confusion might more naturally have arisen from a misunderstanding of the following passage in Ovid's *Heroides*, epistle IX, ll. 67-70:

Non tibi succurit crudi Diomedis imago,  
Efferus humana qui dape pavit equas,  
Si te vidisset cultu Busiris in isto,  
Huic victor victo nempe pudendus eras!

Every reader of Ovid knows that he must be on the watch if he is always to recognize a character under the various names which the poet gives him. So in this passage, the two statements might seem to bear a close relationship, the second confirming the thought suggested in the first and referring to the same person under a different name. Confusion of names was not uncommon in the Middle Ages. A notable instance is that of Walter Burley (1275-1345?), a commentator on Aristotle and a scholar of great fame, who in his *De vita et moribus philosophorum* confused Livius Andronicus with Livy, the historian, and Horatius Flaccus, the poet, with Horatius Pulvillus. That Chaucer, who was not a professional scholar, should have made such mistakes is therefore not surprising.

Though Chaucer's selection of the name Busiris rather than Diomedes may have been mere chance, it is probable that the choice was made designedly to avoid confusion with Diomedes the Grecian hero, whom Chaucer knew in Benoit and whom he afterward used in his own story of *Troilus and Criseyde*.<sup>1</sup> It is unlikely that Chaucer was acquainted with the name Busiris in any connection which would necessarily indicate that he could not be the same person as the tyrant Diomedes mentioned in the *Heroides*. Of all the works in

<sup>1</sup> See G. L. Kittredge, *The Date of Chaucer's Troilus and Other Chaucer Matters*, Chaucer Society, 1905, p. 67.

classical and mediaeval literature containing references to Busiris,<sup>1</sup> there is no probability that Chaucer knew any except the *Metamorphoses* and *Ars amatoria* of Ovid and the *De consolatione philosophiae* of Boethius. These three he must have known, but in none of them is the story of Busiris given in detail. The references to him are as follows:

Ergo ego foedantem peregrino templa cruore  
Busirin domui?

—*Met.* ix. 182–83.

Dicitur Aegyptos caruisse iuvantibus arva  
Imbribus atque annos sicca fuisse novem,  
Cum Thrasius Busirin adit monstratque piari  
Hospitis adfuso sanguine posse Iovem.  
Illi Busiris "fies Iovis hostia primus"  
Inquit "et Aegypto tu dabis hospes aquam."

—*Ars amatoria* i. 647–52.

I have herd told of Busirides that was wont to sleen his gestes that herberweden in his hous; and he was sleyn himself of Ercules that was his gest.—Chaucer's *Translation of Boethius*, Book II, pr. 6.

A casual reading of these references gives no distinct impression of the identity and story of Busiris. Chaucer might have read them and still not have realized that Busiris was any other than the tyrant whom Hercules fed to his own mares. The similarity of the two stories easily tends to confusion: both are labors of Hercules, both are instances of tyrants slain for ruthlessly murdering human beings. If Chaucer mistook the two names in the *Heroides* as referring to one person, his recollection of the passages in the *Metamorphoses*, the *Ars amatoria*, and the *Boethius* would not correct his error. So, as he knew of another Diomedes with whom this one might be confused, and did not know of another Busiris, he would naturally choose the distinctive name.

This supposition that Chaucer would choose a name about which he thought there could be no confusion is not merely a fanciful one.

<sup>1</sup> For a list of such references see Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexikon der griech. u. röm. Mythologie*, under "Busiris." It is possible that Chaucer may have known the following works in which there are references to Busiris, though there is no evidence of any knowledge of these works in his writings: Virgil *Georgics* 3, 5; Claudianus in *Rufinum* l. 255, in *Eutropium* l. 159; Macrobius *Saturnalia* 6, 7; Hyginus *Fab.* 31, 56, 157. In regard to Chaucer's knowledge of these writers see Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer*, II, 250, 255, 277, 278, 287.

We have evidence of what he did under circumstances where there might be uncertainty as to identity. In the *Knight's Tale*, ll. 1204-61, he stops in the midst of his story to explain that in referring to Daphne, who was turned into a tree, he does not mean the goddess Diana:

There saugh I Dane, y-turned til a tree,  
I mene not the goddesse Diane,  
But Penneus doughter, which that highte Dane.

Professor Skeat<sup>1</sup> mentions the confusion of names in the story of Hercules as evidence that Chaucer must have written part of the *Monk's Tale* before 1380, for in his translation of Boethius the name is given correctly:

He overcomer, as it is seyd, hath put an unmeke lord foddre to his cruel hors; this is to syen that Hercules slowh Diomedes and made his hors to freten him.—Boethius, Book IV, metre VII.

But, even if Chaucer had failed to notice the name in this passage in his previous hasty reading, he could not fail, when he came to make his translation, to note that the king who fed his mares on human flesh is here called Diomedes. If we assume, however, that Chaucer thought both names belonged to that tyrant, the occurrence of the name Diomedes would still, even when he considered the passage carefully, have had no significance to him in the way of pointing out his error in the tragedy of Hercules.<sup>2</sup>

### III. AEOLUS IN THE HOUSE OF FAME

In ll. 1571-1605 of the *House of Fame* dealing with Aeolus, god of the winds, we have classical material perhaps from both Ovid and Virgil. The description in ll. 1583-90 of the god in his cave holding the winds in check is from *Aeneid* i. 52-57. Chaucer no doubt had had a long acquaintance with Aeolus from Ovid *Met.* i. 262-64:

Protinus Aeoliis Aquilonem claudit in antris  
Et quaecumque fugant inductas flamina nubes,  
Emittitque Notum.

<sup>1</sup> Skeat, *Oxford Chaucer*, III, 430, note.

<sup>2</sup> The name Diomedes in this passage does not belong to the text of Boethius, but is given, as will be noticed, in the gloss. As the explanations in Chaucer's translation are, however, probably not his own notes, but translations of glosses on the MS of Boethius which he used, or some MS which he had seen, this is of no consequence in the present discussion. For further information on the glosses see the *Globe Chaucer*, Introd., p. xi; Skeat, *Oxford Chaucer*, II, Introd., pp. xxiv and xxxviii.

and also from *Met.* xiv. 223-26:

Aeolon ille refert Tusco regnare profundo,  
 Aeolon Hippotaden, cohibentem carcare ventos:  
 Quos bovis inclusos tergo, memorabile munus,  
 Dulichium sumpsisse ducem.

The incident of Fame's sending her messenger in haste to the cave of Aeolus recalls vividly the commission of Juno to the god of sleep in the *Book of the Duchess*. This latter episode is told by Ovid, *Met.* xi. 585-632.

The conception of Aeolus as a trumpeter deserves special consideration. None of the passages from the classics already referred to represents him with a trumpet. Professor Lounsbury<sup>1</sup> thinks this idea may have come to Chaucer from Albricus Philosophus, who has in a treatise called *De deorum imaginibus* the following passage: "In manu autem utraque tenebat cornua: quae ori ad-movens, ea subflare, et ab unoquoque cornum sex ventos emittere videbatur."

Probably, however, we need to look no farther than Virgil vi 162-74, for the idea of Aeolus as a trumpeter:

Atque illi Misenum in litore sicco,  
 Ut venere, vident indigna morte peremptum,  
 Misenum Aeoliden, quo non praestantior alter  
 Aere ciere viros, Martemque accendere cantu.  
 Hectoris hic magni fuerat comes; Hectora circum  
 Et lituo pugnas insignis obibat et hasta.  
 Postquam illum vita victor spoliavit Achilles;  
 Dardanio Aeneae sese fortissimus heros  
 Addiderat socium, non inferiora secutus.  
 Sed tum, forte cava dum personat aequora concha,  
 Demens, et cantu vocat in certamina divos,  
 Aemulus exceptum Triton—si credere dignum est—  
 Inter saxa virum spumosa immerserat unda.

<sup>1</sup> Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer*, II, 381-82. Lounsbury says Albricus Philosophus is described as a Londoner of the early part of the thirteenth century. "No dictionary of English biography contains his name or gives the slightest account of his life. The work by which he is known—if he can strictly be said to be known at all—is a treatise entitled *De deorum imaginibus*. It consists of a series of sketches of heathen gods and goddesses and of a few other mythological personages." This treatise, which is very short, is contained in Van Steveren's *Auctores mythographi Latini*. Albricus, to whom Lounsbury traces also slight obligations in the *Knight's Tale*, is mentioned in the *De causa Dei* of Bradwardine whose name appears in the *Nun's Priest's Tale*.

Modern commentators have generally taken this Aeolus who was the father of Misenus to be a mortal and probably the man whose death is related in *Aeneid* xii. 542. But the father of Misenus was for a long time supposed by commentators to be Aeolus, god of the winds. Dryden<sup>1</sup> translated *Aeneid* vi. 164 as follows:

Misenus lay extended on the shore  
*Son of the God of the Winds:* none so renown'd.

In a revision of Dryden's translation<sup>2</sup> in 1803 the editor allowed this passage to remain unchanged. Davidson in his translation of Virgil,<sup>3</sup> also of 1803, understood this name to refer to the god of the winds and gives his explanation of why Misenus was called his son. In a note on *Aeneid* vi. 164, he says: "Misenus Aeoliden, Misenus, the son of Aeolus. This is only a figurative genealogy, as we call warriors sons of Mars, so Misenus, who excelled in blowing the trumpet, which is a wind instrument, is called a son of the god of the wind."

Not until the day of modern accurate scholarship do we come upon a different explanation of who this Aeolus was. In the Heyne-Wagner edition<sup>4</sup> of 1832 occurs this comment on *Aeoliden*: "Aeolidum appellat Misenus, Aeoli filium, tanquam ejusdem Aeoli Trojani, quem in pugna cum Latinis occubuisse narrat, xii. 542 sq."

Anthon<sup>5</sup> in his edition of Virgil sums up the matter thus: "Aeoliden, 'Son of Aeolus.' Many commentators suppose that as Misenus played upon a wind instrument, the poet, by a figurative genealogy, makes him the son of the wind god. Not so, however. Virgil calls him Aeolides, as indicating merely his descent from a natural father, named Aeolus, probably the same with the one who is said to have fallen in battle with the Latins (*Aen.* xii. 542 seqq.—Heyne, Excurs. VII ad *Aen.* VI)." Roscher likewise considers the Aeolus here mentioned a mortal.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dryden, *The Works of Virgil Translated into English Verse*, London, MDCCXXI, Vol. II, Bk. vi, ll. 242-43.

<sup>2</sup> Dryden, *The Works of Virgil Translated into English Verse*, ed. Carey, London, 1803, Vol. II, p. 220.

<sup>3</sup> Davidson, *The Works of Virgil Trans. into Eng. Prose*, New York, 1803, Vol. II.

<sup>4</sup> *P. Virgilii Maronis opera*, ed. Heyne-Wagner, Leipzig and London, 1830-41, Excursus VII to Book vi, 162 ff.

<sup>5</sup> *The Aeneid of Virgil*, ed. Anthon, New York, 1853.

<sup>6</sup> "Vgl. auch *Aen.* 6, 164 und 9, 774, wo Söhne eines Trojaners Aiolos (Misenus und Clytius) genannt werden."—*Ausführliches Lexikon der griech. u. röm. Mythologie*, Vol. I, p. 195. However, Harper's *Dictionary of Classical Literature and Antiquities*, 1897, gives again the old explanation that the Aeolus referred to here is the god of the winds.



In the light of this history of the commentary upon this name, it seems not an unwarranted assumption to suppose that Chaucer's knowledge was no more accurate than that of the commentators, and that he shared the common idea that the Aeolus here referred to was the god of the winds. As Misenus was called "son of Aeolus" because he was such a great trumpeter, the inference would naturally be that Aeolus himself was a great trumpeter. Thus it may have been that Chaucer got his impression that Aeolus was a trumpeter. The winds as a means of spreading tidings would be an easy conception to Chaucer. We say today of telling a secret to a gossip person, "As well tell it to the winds." So Aeolus, god of the winds, with his mighty trumpet would make a suitable herald of renown. Altogether, then, it seems quite probable that Chaucer may have had no other source than Virgil for his conception of Aeolus with his trumpet acting as the herald of the goddess Fame.

But there is another source which may have furnished Chaucer an interpretation of this passage of Virgil's. Boccaccio in the *De genealogia deorum*, commenting upon Virgil's *Misenum Aeoliden*, not only takes this Aeolus to be the god of the winds but also offers an explanation of why a trumpeter should be called his son:

Misenus Aeoli fuit filius ut ait Virgilius. Misenum Aeoliden quo non praestantior alter Aere ciere viros, martemque accendere cantu. . . . Nunc quoniam simpliciter a Virgilio dicta vera non sunt, quod sit absconditum advertendum. Fingit ergo Misenum Aeoli filium eo que fuit tubicen: nam tubae sonus nil aliud est quam spiritus per fistulam ab ore emissus: sicuti et ventus et aer impulsus, et per terrae fistulas e cavernis emissus: et quia ventorum Aeolus deus dicatur, quasi eorum auctor sit: a similitudine operis Misenus ejus dicitur filius.<sup>1</sup>

This commentary from a contemporary of Chaucer's no doubt indicates that this Aeolus was generally understood in the Middle Ages to be the god of the winds.

Triton, who is represented by Chaucer as the companion of Aeolus, was in classical mythology a famous trumpeter. He appears in the *Aeneid* three times at least as a sea-god. In i. 144, he is merely assisting in pushing off the ships that have been driven upon the sand by the storm. In ii. 173, the passage already quoted in the

<sup>1</sup> Boccaccio, *De genealogia deorum*, 1511, Liber XIII, cap. xxiii.

discussion of Aeolus, Triton is represented as causing the death of Misenus, because Misenus had boasted of rivaling the gods with the blasts upon his trumpet. Again in *Aeneid* x. 209, Triton is referred to as a trumpeter:

Hunc vehit immanis Triton et caerula concha  
Exterrens freta.

In Ovid *Met.* i. 330-42, there is a more detailed account of Triton and his trumpet:

Nec maris ira manet, positaque tricuspidè telo  
Mulcet aquas rector pelagi supraque profundum  
Extantem atque umeros innato murice tectum  
Caeruleum Tritona vocat, conchaeque sonanti  
Inspirare iubet, fluctusque et flumina signo  
Iam revocare dato, cava bucina sumitur illi  
Tortilis, in latum quae turbine crescit ab imo,  
Bucina, quae medio concepit ubi aëra ponto,  
Litora voce replet sub utroque iacentia Phoebe.  
Tunc quoque, ut ora dei madida rorantia barba  
Contigit, et cecinit iussos inflata receptus,  
Omnibus audita est telluris et aequoris undis,  
Et quibus est undis audita, coëreuit omnes.

A mere knowledge of Triton as a trumpeter would of course have been sufficient to suggest him to Chaucer as a suitable person to accompany Aeolus on this journey to the palace of Fame, but it is especially significant that his name and function appear in the same passage from which it may be supposed that Chaucer derived his idea of using Aeolus as a herald of tidings.

Chaucer says Aeolus was to be found in Thrace:

In Trace ther ye shul him finde.  
—H.F. 1572.

In a contree that highte Trace  
This Aeolus with harde grace  
Held the windes in distresse.  
—H.F. 1585-87.

Now there is nothing in the *Aeneid* or in the *Metamorphoses* to indicate this connection of Aeolus with Thrace. Skeat<sup>1</sup> says the

<sup>1</sup> *Oxford Chaucer*, III, 279, note on l. 1571.

connection is not obvious but suggests that it may be based upon Ovid's phrase *Threicio Borea* in *Ars am.* ii. 431. It is possible that such a hint might have been sufficient to furnish Chaucer his idea, but there is another source which suggests more strongly the connection between Aeolus and Thrace. In the *Argonauticon* of Valerius Flaccus,<sup>1</sup> i. 596-610, there is an account of the rage of Boreas, whose home was on Pangaeus, a mountain of Thrace, against the Argonauts. All the winds, when they are let loose by Aeolus, are called in this account *Thracēs equi*:

Nuntius hunc solis Boreas proturbat ab alto:  
 Pangaea quod ab arce nefas, ait, Aeole vidi!  
 Graja novam ferro molem commenta juvenus  
 Pergit, et ingenti gaudens domat aequora velo:  
 Nec mihi libertas imis freta tollere harenis.  
 Quilis eram, nondum vinclis et carcere clausus!  
 Huic animi structaeque viris fiducia puppis,  
 Quod Borean sub rege vident. Da mergere Grajos,  
 Insanamque ratem; nil me mea pignora tangunt,  
 Tantum hominum compresce minas, dum litora juxta  
 Thessala, nec dum aliae viderunt carbasa terrae  
 Dixerat. At cuncti fremere intus et aequora venti  
 Poscere. Tum valido contortam turbine portam  
 Impulit Hippotades: fundunt se carcere laeti  
 Thracēs equi: Zephyrusque, et nocti concolor alas  
 Nimborum cum prole Notus; crinemque procellis  
 Hispidus, et multa flavus caput Eurus harena,  
 Induxere hiemem.

In calling the winds Thracian horses Valerius Flaccus is following Apollonius Rhodius<sup>2</sup> who seems to place Aeolus in Thrace. Earlier in the account quoted from, Valerius mentions Aeolia as the home of Aeolus apparently following Virgil.<sup>3</sup> In this same connection Valerius uses the adjectives Tyrrhenian<sup>4</sup> and Trinacrian,<sup>5</sup> but without a pretty thorough knowledge of classical geography, which we have

<sup>1</sup> Chaucer's acquaintance with Valerius Flaccus is still an unsettled point.

<sup>2</sup> Apollonius Rhodius i. 954; iv. 765.

<sup>3</sup> *Aeneid* i. 52.

<sup>4</sup> Continuo Aeolium Tyrrhenaque tendit ad antra  
 Concitus [ll. 576-77].

<sup>5</sup> Aequare Trinacrio, refugique a parte Pelori  
 Stat rupes horrenda fretis ll. 579-80].

little reason to suppose Chaucer had, he might still have had a very hazy idea of the location of Aeolia. Especially is this likely when we consider that there were also apparently an Aeolia in Greece and one in Asia Minor. The reference to Thrace was plain, and Aeolia, a name derived from the god's own, might well have been supposed to indicate the immediate location of his abode in Thrace.

EDGAR F. SHANNON

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS

## TWO OF PERCY'S PLAYS AS PROOF OF THE ELIZABETHAN STAGE

During the last few years two plays of William Percy, *The Cuckqueans and Cuckolds Errants* and the *Faery Pastoral*, have played an important part in most of the extended studies of the Shaksperian stage and staging. Mr. G. F. Reynolds, especially, has been constantly citing them and quoting long extracts from their stage directions in his studies of the Elizabethan stage.<sup>1</sup> He considers them of "great value" because they have been "made from the author's manuscript uninfluenced by stage performance." But an author's MS, though direct from his hand as Percy's is, is not all we have to consider; an examination of the construction and purpose of the plays in question must first be made before any of the stage directions can be safely used in a study of the Elizabethan stage.

The history of Percy's MS will be conveniently found in Schelling's *The Elizabethan Drama*.<sup>2</sup> William Percy during his lifetime (1573-1648) wrote in his own hand in a folio volume six plays. According to Fleay, the plays were written from 1601 to 1603.<sup>3</sup> The volume was never published and no duplicates or actors' copies are known to exist. There is, indeed, no positive evidence that the plays were ever acted. The MS found its way into the Duke of Roxburghe's

<sup>1</sup> "Some Principles of Elizabethan Staging," *Modern Philology*, April and June, 1905; and "What We Know of the Elizabethan Stage," *ibid.*, July, 1911. See also Carl Grabau, "Zur englischen Bühne um 1600," *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, 1902; G. P. Baker, *The Development of Shakespeare as a Dramatist*; F. E. Schelling, *The Elizabethan Drama*. C. W. Wallace in *The Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars, 1597-1603* offers a brief protest against these plays: "But there is no evidence that *The Faery Pastoral* or any other play in the MS volume by Percy was ever acted by any company. His works doubtless belong to that numerous host [cf. Collier, *History of Dramatic Poetry and Annals of the English Stage*, III, 231-32] that, for unsuitableness or other reasons, never trod the boards. Hence I set no special value upon the elaborate and impossible stage-directions or other items taken seriously by many as touching vital points in stage-history." In my own study, *The Shaksperian Stage*, for want of space and time for a full discussion I set them aside with the single statement that they "were not written to be played according to the regular methods of staging, and must therefore be barred in a study of principles of Elizabethan staging." The plays were, of course, referred to in connection with the stage long ago. Collier calls attention to them in his discussion of the Elizabethan stage, *op. cit.*, III, 163.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. I, 464-65.

<sup>3</sup> *Chronicle History of the English Drama*, II, 162.

library in 1796, and in 1824 two of the plays, *The Cuckqueans and Cuckolds Errants* and the *Faery Pastoral*, were published by Joseph Halsewood for the Roxburghe Club. The other four plays still remain unpublished. Owing to this condition of publication, only *Cuckqueans and Cuckolds Errants* and the *Faery Pastoral* are widely known or have been used to any extent in studies on the stage. It is therefore with these two dramas that we are concerned in this essay. As the two plays are somewhat different, the staging will be more clearly understood by examining each play separately.

#### I. CUCKQUEANS AND CUCKOLDS ERRANTS

As the title suggests, the theme of *Cuckqueans and Cuckolds Errants* is cuckoldry. Two Oxford students, after a year of independent travel abroad, return to England. They do not, however, go at once to their homes, but each by chance meets and falls in love with the other's wife. Circumstances eventually calling them to their own homes, they find that their wives have been untrue to them, and immediately desert them. The two forsaken women start out from their respective homes, but fortunately meet and continue to wander about the country together, coming finally at nightfall to the Tarlton Inn. The two students, in the meantime, have likewise fortunately met in a forester's lodge, where they at once become very good friends with the forester's wife. Therefore exit forester. The students now decide to become soldiers, with the forester's wife as their captain. About midnight the three come to the Tarlton Inn where they find the forester in too friendly relation with the deserted wives. A great hubbub ensues, which finally ends in a beautiful reconciliation of the cuckqueans and cuckolds and a vow to live chaste lives ever afterward. The sub-plot gives the adventures of two lifts, street gamins, who, together with an innkeeper, rob a lawyer of his famous drinking-bowl, and thereby set the lawyer and his wife at fisticuffs with each other.

The theme, therefore, impossible and scandalous as it is, offers nothing very unusual in the Elizabethan drama. But here all relationship with that drama ends. The style, form, and method of staging the play show no connection with the regular London playhouses.



In the first place, the style indicates that it was written without any knowledge of, or at least respect to, the pit-gallery London audience. Latin words, phrases, and sentences are lavishly scattered through it. Fifteen of the characters speak Latin with perfect ease and understanding. The lawyer, the students, and the two ladies might use a foreign expression occasionally without calling forth comment; but when ghosts, soldiers, tradesmen, servants, maids, inn-keepers, and street gamins all use perfect Latin with equal fluency, there must be something very limited in the author's knowledge of the English people, and in the audience for which he writes.

The regular Elizabethan dramatists used an occasional Latin phrase in their plays, but with a purpose—for a joke, for characterization, etc. In this play the Latin, in most cases, serves no end, except to air the writer's knowledge of the classics. Here are a few illustrations:

*Shift* [street gamin]: Myne Host Pigot, what needed this stirr? *Quod defertur non aufertur*, thou shalt haue it all, before night, I assure thee, Man.

*Pig.* [innkeeper]: *Qui non est hodie cras minus aptus erit.*

*Flo.* [to his wife]: I can no longer hold, Therefore t' outface  
The shamles Impudency, loe, strumpet,  
What I haue found, among thy boxes, late.

*Raf.* [Floridan's servant, aside]: *Victus, y faith victus, victa, victum.*

*Perl.* Mr. Captaines, wee do beseech your worships both, you would but vouchsafe us your worships cares both, *Sedibus haec imis, Res est non parua locetis.*

Other evidences of misappropriated learning may be pointed out: Rafe, a servant, advises his mistress to bear her cross with more than "Grisilaean Magnanimity." Janekin, waiting woman to Arvania, speaks of "Artemidorus of dreames." The Goldsmith says, "as Chaucer verie adaptly hath applied it." The innkeeper calls the two street gamins "honest Homers." The Goldsmith remarks to Pearle who has been using some Latin phrases: "Not too deepe, I pray you yet, least your worship chaunce be choakt with a grape as was once your Authour." The Goldsmith must have been an exceptionally learned tradesman to be able not only to recognize the

Latin author from the few lines quoted, but to know that that author once choked on a grape. All have mythology at their tongue's end. Tradesmen, servants, and shop lifts use mythological terms as freely as the lawyer and the students. Indeed the whole dialogue is such as one might expect to find in a crowd of Oxford students, where phrases of Latin and learned expressions are freely mixed with much smutty talk, humorous and intelligible to them but wholly unhumorous and unintelligible to the rank and file of a London audience. Certainly this dialogue was not meant to split the ears of the groundlings.

Another evidence of this play's aloofness from the regular Elizabethan drama is its careful division into acts and scenes according to the method of Plautus and Terence. Every time a character enters or leaves the stage, a new scene is marked in the text. Forty-one scenes in all are thus listed. Most of the scenes open without stating "Enter so and so," except for an occasional marginal note, but simply with a list of the *dramatis personae* for the scene, and close without any exit for the characters. In the monologues, in the true Terentian fashion, a character may speak directly to the audience, telling them what he has done or is about to do: Pearle says on leaving the stage: "But viah, as very well sayeth that the dusty Prouerbe, Forewarnd forearmd, and therefore, for to Jogge it furth my worshipfull hed, before it settle, I will, presently, in, to Market, and see there, what sweet Fish there is, for dinner, now to be had. So a good god morrowe, vnto you all now, Gentlemen, the whiles." Later on in the play Wright says on entering the stage alone: "Loe you all, honest Gentlemen, I haue ended, here, his Bolle for him, yet notwithstanding, I dare auouch, for him that a foolisher gawde hath neuer, yet, beene aduised, nay nor, yet, deuised, by any hath, in him, a reasonable soule to be saued by. Thus may good stuff be abused, you see, if it fall into a Fooles hand."

Lastly, the play is staged distinctly in the manner of a Plautan comedy and not of a Shaksperian. The opening directions are: "Harwich, In Midde of the Stage Colchester with Image of Tarlton, Signe and Ghirlond under him also. The Raungers Lodge, Maldon, A Ladder of Roapes trussd up neare Harwich. Highest and aloft the Title THE CUCK-QUEANES AND CUCKOLDS ERRANTS. A

Long Fourme."<sup>1</sup> Here we have the usual Latin stage—a street or open space before two or more houses, doors, or places. On the right is the home of Floridan in Harwich, on the left that of Claribel in Maldon; in the center rear is the Tarlton Inn in Colchester, with the home of Pearle on the left and the forester's lodge on the right. Before the inn door, or before any of the doors, stands the "fourme," or bench.<sup>2</sup>

The scene never changes throughout the play. All the visible action takes place on this neutral ground or at the doors of the various houses. Whatever takes place in the interior of the houses is reported by the noise that is made or by the characters who kindly come out and discuss the indoor action for the benefit of the audience. The characters come and go freely by the streets or by the doors as the situation may demand. They happen to be passing over this open space, or come to and from their homes, or appear before the doors and call the inmates out. Here is a fair example of the method: The lawyer, accompanied by the goldsmith, brings two of his friends to his home to show them his marvelous wine-bowl. The two street

<sup>1</sup> The towns in this theatrical world are, of course, brought into closer relation than in real life. Some students have supposed that there were sign boards over the doors, stating that the one side was Harwich, the other Maldon, and the rear Colchester, but there is absolutely no mention of them in the directions or text and no need of them on the stage to make the action clear.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Reynolds, in "Some Principles of Elizabethan Staging," *Modern Philology*, April, 1905, explains the use of the bench as follows: "The rear stage seems to have represented [the inn], for in Act V two maids in this inn sit on the 'long fourme' and tell each other dreams." He does not understand the situation at all. And this is the case with many of his explanations of situations in Elizabethan plays. He is a very careful, conscientious worker and deserves much credit for his efforts, but he lacks perspective—he cannot see the wood for the trees. An understanding of the general custom of play-writing and play-production in Shakspeare's time must first be understood before a single stage direction can be safely used to prove one's theories. Moreover, the Elizabethan stage must be studied in the light of the complete development of the English stage and of its relation to the stages of other countries. These matters need not enter the discussion itself, but the student must hold them in perspective. Apparently Mr. Reynolds began his work with the ideas of his early school days firmly fixed in his mind, days when the Elizabethan stage was considered a crude, incongruous, laughable affair. Instead of throwing aside these misconceptions and investigating the question broadly with a free, unbiased mind, he proceeded to search out from the remote corners of the Elizabethan drama as many crude, incongruous situations as he could find. And with a handful of such cases—many wrongly understood, as the above instance—he confirmed his ideas. He terms himself an ancientist as opposed to the other workers on the subject whom he calls modernists. This nomenclature is perhaps not inappropriate, providing it is understood that his ancientness goes back only to the last century when the Elizabethan stage and staging were merely guessed at and not made the object of special research.

thieves and the innkeeper "stand close." The lawyer approaches his door and calls out:

*Perl:* Hoa, Christian, Hoa.

ACT III, Sc. 6

Christian Sanders Pearle Wright Periman Nim Shift Pigot  
*Christ.:* Here, forsooth, Husband.

This method of staging is Latin, but emphatically not English. The body of regular Elizabethan plays demands an entirely different arrangement of the stage. The different scenes in an Elizabethan play may be a wood, a street, a bedroom, a hall, a battle-field, etc., each in an entirely different location. The scenes are constantly changing. The stage is now a presence chamber of the king, now a battle-field, now a wood, now a street, and so on. Anyone who is familiar with the Elizabethan drama and the Latin drama knows that the stages for the two are entirely different.

To conclude with this play, the style, the form, and the method of staging of *Cuckqueans* and *Cuckolds Errants* show that the author had in mind not the Elizabethan stage but the Latin stage. The plays of Plautus and Terence were read, studied, and played at the schools and universities. These the students naturally imitated in writing plays, and not until they became part of the whirl of the great London drama did they lay aside their textbooks. This Percy did not do in *Cuckqueans* and *Cuckolds Errants*. Therefore, one may as well quote directions from Plautus and Terence to prove his theories of the Shaksperian stage as from this play.

II. FAERY PASTORAL

*The Faery Pastoral* seems to be a pedant's attempt at a Latinized play for court. The plot is very slight. In fact, the play consists of a number of plots connected by little more than the faeryland setting. Oberon and Chloris, king and queen of the faeries, appear once on the stage and have their dispute as to whose is the greater love, a man's or a woman's, settled by Tyresias, the blind prophet of Thebes, who is led by Mercury. Prince Orion, having been appointed by Oberon to supersede Princess Hypsiphyle as protector of Elvida, contests in a hunting-match with the Princess for the forest and her

hand in marriage. Three faery huntsmen are in love with three faery huntresses. At first the men are duped by the women; one is put in a well, another is persuaded to enter a hollow oak tree that is full of bees, and the third swoons from long chasing through the forest after the elusive sound of his mistress' horn. To even up matters, the women are in turn tricked by the men; one is put in a hot kiln, another in a fawn's stable, and the third is made owlet-eyed by gazing at the sun too long. Christophel, a keeper of the forest, idles away his time with two faery pages, ostensibly trying to change himself from a "Gore-belly Daemon" to an elf. A schoolmaster makes himself the laughing-stock of some faery children by trying to teach them Latin and incidentally a good deal of vulgarity. Oberon and Chloris settle their trouble at their first and only appearance. The prince and princess reappear at the end to celebrate their nuptials, and to reconcile the hunters and huntresses to each other and to the fate of marriage.

Thus with this slight plot, the interest, such as it is, must rely strongly on the setting. And this we find to be true. At the opening the following directions are given:

Highest, aloft, and on the Top of the Musick Tree the Title THE FAERY PASTORALL, Beneath him pind on Post of the Tree The Scene ELUIDA FORREST. Lowest off all ouer the Canopie NAIHITBOΔAION or FAERY CHAPPELL. A kiln of Brick. A Fowen Cott. A Hollowe Oake with vice of wood to shutt to. A Lowe well with Roape and Pullye. A Fourme of Turues. A Greene Bank being Pillowe to the Hed but. Lastly A Hole to creepe in and out.

Here we have a rather elaborate faeryland setting. Under the high trees are a faery chapel, a fawn's shelter, and a kiln, somewhere among which are a well and a long turf bench with a green bank at one end. All these stand reasonably well together in a setting for a faery play. No change takes place through the entire play, except at the end where the chapel is opened and closed. All the action takes place on this one setting. One group of faeries and foresters appear and strut and fret their hour upon the stage and pass off for another group. At the close the majority of the characters assemble here for the "Catastrophe of the Comœdy," as Percy says.

Orion with a Letter reading, Hypsiphyle Learchus Picus Hippolon Florida Camilla Fancia Atys Hylas Christophel, The Six Hunstmen Men and Women bearing on either syde a Banquet of diuers and sundry sorts of Junkets in goodly Gold and Syluer Bolles, Syluius and Syluia on either syde of them with Two venice Mazers or standing Bolles of glasse, The one with a Fragrant Malmsey, the other with Spanish Sack. Orion and Hypsiphyle in their wedding ornaments. Orion takes his Bride by the hand, then speaks as followes.

After his speech:

Here Atys, the Princes hauing seated themselves, stepping betweene the Two Chorus sayd the Apologie following with one Accord of the rest to the Princes in manner and forme following.

When the apologue is ended:

Here Syluis ane Syluia, stepping up the degrees, after had set the venice glasses or Mazers on either syde the Princes, The Sack by Hypsiphyle and the Malmeseye by Orion, Then holding the Imperiall Ghirlond, that hung ouer the Front of the Chapell, ouer both their heds, And than setting him alone on the heade of Orion, The whole Chorus of Huntsmen men and women Saluted his Maiesty all with one Accord.

This is evidently not the staging for a regular Shaksperian play—one scene as opposed to many. Compare it, for example, with *Hamlet*, a typical Elizabethan play. The stage at one time is a parapet, at another the presence chamber of the King, at another a hall in the palace arranged for a play, at another the Queen's closet, at another a graveyard, and so on. How far removed this is from the setting of the *Faery Pastoral* where all is one scene which never changes from the beginning to the end! Plainly Percy's play has no connection with the regular stage. Its setting resembles mainly that of a court production, and doubtless the possibilities of a court stage were uppermost in the author's mind in writing his play.

Its remoteness to the regular Elizabethan stage is further shown by its style. Latin words, phrases, and sentences abound. More than a dozen of the characters are conversant with Latin, from the king and queen, prince and princess, down to the faery pages, and the gore-belly keeper. Mythology they know, perhaps, by right, for they are faeries and mythological beings themselves. All are remarkably familiar with the classics. The keeper says: "Yet



#### PERCY'S PLAYS AS PROOF OF ELIZABETHAN STAGE

Plinie an Assured Truth-Teller alloweth in Birds Quadruplicity of them." David says: "For it was Ciceroes own Inuention (as Mr. Acham sayes)." Picus says: "Nay, I think Camilla's extract from line of that Camilla in greate Virgil told."

And still further, this play's divergence from the regular Elizabethan plays is shown by its form. Every entrance and every exit is, in the regular Latin manner, marked by a new scene. Thus there are thirty-two scenes in the play. No exits are given, and many of the scenes open simply with a list of the characters. The entire action takes place in one day and on one setting. Terence's plays are twice referred to, once in the Prologue, and once in Act II, Scene ii.

Therefore, the setting, style, and form of the *Faery Pastoral* show clearly that this faery story was not written with the regular Elizabethan stage in mind. It is an attempted Court play written by a student rhymmer with Plautus on his right hand and Terence on his left, and with a bookcase filled with well-worn classics near him. The Prologue was written for the Court and "An alteration" was appended "Thus for Some or For Powles whither the better." That he hoped his play might be given at Court and at St. Paul's School is evident, but that it was ever played anywhere is extremely doubtful. Indeed his ambitions for his play were unbounded; in the opening directions he says: "Now if so be that the Properties of any These, that be outward, will not serue the turne by reason of concurse of the People on the Stage, Then you may omitt the sayd Properties which be outward and supplye their Places with their Nuncupations onely in Text Letters." Anyone who reads this play will doubtless think, as I do, that this change was never called for. What Percy needed was some knowledge of dramaturgy and the English stage. If he had laid aside his classics and his scribbling and attended the Globe where Burbage was giving the first performances of *Hamlet*, he *might* have written a piece that would have at least some resemblance to an Elizabethan play.

In conclusion, the directions in *Cuckqueans and Cuckolds Errants* and the *Faery Pastoral* are not "curious," and not "strange," and not even "interesting" when one once understands the nature of the plays. The only "strange" and "curious" thing is that professed

students of the English drama should fail to see that *Cuckolds Errants* and the *Faery Pastoral* have no connection whatever with the regular Elizabethan stage. And the only "interesting" thing is the light—or shadow—that is thrown on the studies of those who use these plays to prove their theories of Shaksperian staging.

VICTOR E. ALBRIGHT

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

## THE MARRIAGE GROUP IN THE CANTERBURY TALES

In a delightful and illuminating article in an earlier issue of *Modern Philology*,<sup>1</sup> Professor Kittredge has commented at some length upon Chaucer's discussion of marriage in the *Canterbury Tales*. The Wife of Bath first sets forth her convictions in regard to matrimony and the experiences by which these convictions are fortified. The text which she defends in her Prologue and Tale, with her own inimitable vivacity, is:

Wommen desiren to have sovereyntee  
As wel over hir housbond as hir love,  
And for to been in maistrie him above.

Wives, then, should rule their husbands; the mastery should be in the hands of the woman. This heresy is rebutted, after the "comic interlude" furnished by the Summoner and the Friar, in the eloquence of the Clerk of Oxford, who drives home his point with particular energy in his Envoy. "Yes, ladies, rule your husbands, and make them thoroughly miserable!" The Merchant then follows with a bitter attack upon women, and upon the wedded state in general, in a story noteworthy for its sustained and savage irony. Finally, after the Squire's Tale has been told—which is "pure romance," unconnected with the burning topic under discussion—the Franklin shows, in his charming narrative of Arviragus and Dorigen, that "the difficulty about mastery vanishes when mutual love and forbearance are made the guiding principles of the relation between husband and wife." With this tale, then, the Marriage Group ends.

"The Wife of Bath's Prologue," says Professor Kittredge, "begins a Group in the *Canterbury Tales*, or, as one may say, a new act in the drama. It is not connected with anything that precedes." He further suggests<sup>2</sup> that Chaucer had probably not determined what connection was to be made between it and the portion of the *Canterbury Tales* that comes before. Now the Wife's Prologue is, indeed, not introduced by any transitional matter such as regularly binds together the tales within a Group. But does Dame Alisoun's long narrative of her marital experiences come, as it were, out of the

<sup>1</sup> Vol. IX, No. 4, April 1912, pp. 435-67. <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 439, and footnote 1; cf. also p. 467.

blue sky, with no previous provocation to explain its vehemence? Is she the only begetter of this debate among the Pilgrims? I do not think so. While her Prologue, by reason of its detailed attention to the subject, may well be called the beginning of the Marriage Group, it is not by any means the beginning of those discussions of "maistrye" between husband and wife with which this group is chiefly concerned. The Wife is not sowing discord among the Pilgrims, she is defending herself and her sex against previous attacks. Her Prologue, therefore, appears to gain in effectiveness when examined in the light of the material which precedes. The question as to what connection Chaucer intended to make between this material and her Prologue is, then, really of considerable interest.<sup>1</sup> And we may, I think, despite the abrupt opening of this Prologue, see pretty clearly Chaucer's general intention as to the connection of the Wife's utterances with those of the Pilgrims who have already had their say.

In order to understand these relationships clearly we must go back to the "Tale of Melibeus." The Host, it will be remembered, has interrupted with the utmost rudeness Chaucer's "Tale of Sir Thopas," and Chaucer has—apparently—kissed the rod, accepting the Host's rebuff in all meekness.

"No more of this, for goddes dignitee,"  
 Quod oure hoste, "for thou makest me  
 So wery of thy verray lewednesse  
 That, also wisly god my soule blesse,  
 Myn eres aken of thy drasty speche;  
 Now swiche a rym the devel I biteche!  
 This may well be rym dogerel," quod he.

"Lat se wher thou canst tellen aught in geste,  
 Or telle in prose somewhat at the leste  
 In whiche ther be som mirthe or som doctrine."

"Gladly," quod I, "by goddes swete pyne,  
 I wol yow telle a litel thing in prose,  
 That oghte lyken yow, as I suppose,  
 Or elles, certes, ye been to daungerous.  
 It is a moral tale vertuous."<sup>2</sup>

But is not Chaucer in this Prologue (which is too long to quote in full) slyly retaliating upon the Host? And does he not carry his

<sup>1</sup> Cf. footnote, *loc. cit.*

<sup>2</sup> B 2109 ff. The citations are from Skeat's edition of the complete works, Oxford, 1899, etc.

revenge still farther in the "Tale of Melibeus" which follows? Dramatic effectiveness is often gained in the *Canterbury Tales* by satire in which the Pilgrims indulge at each other's expense, and it seems likely enough that Chaucer himself, the arch-satirist of them all, should get even with the Host in this way, after he has been so rudely snubbed. The Host, the self-constituted "juge and reportour" of the stories, has missed the point of "Sir Thopas," a little parody of the affectations of the poorer metrical romances. He has not the wit to see the joke. But that does not excuse his coarse and peremptory language to the teller, who, with mock modesty, protests that it is the best tale he knows. So Chaucer assures the Host that he shall have what he wants, "a moral tale vertuous," full of the "doctrine" demanded. And Chaucer further complies with the Host's desire for "som mirthe" by telling him it shall be "a mery tale" (2154). The poet also apologizes for putting in "somwhat more of proverbes" than there is in the original—although as a matter of fact he does nothing of the sort, but translates very faithfully. The implication is clear. He is stressing the heavy moral character of the tale to come. Provided the thing bristles with edification the Host will be pleased. It is impossible not to see irony in all this, and in Chaucer's description of this long-winded moral discourse as "a little thing." Moreover, the "Melibeus" is admirably suited for revenge upon the Host for another reason. He may not perceive the subtlety of Chaucer's satire on his failure to understand a literary jest, but he shall be pricked by a thrust which he cannot fail to feel.

Before we proceed to examine the nature of this thrust, it may be well to say that Chaucer was no doubt interested in the "Melibeus" for its own sake. Such treatises as this found a favorable reception in the fourteenth century, however dull they may appear to modern readers.<sup>1</sup> That Chaucer avenged himself for the interruption of his "Sir Thopas" by inflicting a dead weight of tedium upon his hearers, as Dr. Mather once suggested,<sup>2</sup> is unthinkable. Chaucer's retaliation, we may be sure, is not so clumsy. The situation is rather as if a pianist, being snubbed by an ignorant critic for triviality in

<sup>1</sup> See the excellent discussion in Tatlock's *Development and Chronology of Chaucer's Works*, Chaucer Society, 1907, pp. 189 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Chaucer's Prologue, Knight's Tale, and Nun's Priest's Tale*, Boston, 1899, *Introd.*, pp. xiv, xv, xxxi (also criticized, Tatlock, *loc. cit.*).

playing some light *humoresque*, should perform a sonata of ponderous weight and length, though an admirable and masterly composition, to which his critic could never object on the score of its lightness. The "Tale of Melibeus" is an implied rebuke to narrowness of literary taste. It is surely not meant to be an awful example of excess in didacticism, as "Sir Thopas" is of excess in romantic conventionality.

It has already been said that the Host is pricked with a less subtle thrust than this. The "Melibeus" illustrates the virtue of forbearance, the desirability of settling disputes by appeals to reason rather than to force. Melibeus has been severely wounded by his enemies, who have broken into his house and ill-treated his wife and daughter. But this "noble wyf" Prudence, whose character is sufficiently revealed by her name, counsels patience and a peaceful adjustment of the dispute. Throughout the story this serene and sententious female holds the center of the stage. From her mouth proceed most of the "proverbs" and citations of authorities. Melibeus stands by, completely subdued to the will of his strong-minded spouse, and thanks God "that him sente a wyf of so greet discrecioun." The real hero of the "Tale of Melibeus" is Dame Prudence.

The moment Chaucer has spoken the last word, the Host contrasts this patient wife, this comfort to her husband, with his own shrewish mate:

Whan ended was my tale of Melibee,  
And of Prudence and hir benignitee,  
Our Hoste seyde, "As I am faithful man,  
And by the precious *corpus Madrian*,  
I hadde lever than a barel ale  
That goode lief my wyf hadde herd this tale!  
For she nis no-thing of swich pacience  
As was this Melibeus wyf Prudence.  
By goddes bones! whan I bete my knaves,  
She bringth me forth the grete clobbered staves,  
And cryeth, 'slee the dogges everichoon,  
And brek hem, bothe bak and every boon!"

.....  
This is my lyf, but-if that I wol fighte;  
And out at dore anon I moot me dighte,  
Or elles I am but lost, but-if that I  
Be lyk a wilde leoun fool-hardy."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> B 3079 ff.

Never does the Host speak with more depth of feeling. All the savage moments of his spouse rise in grisly distinctness before him, with the humiliating and hasty exits "out at dore" which her ferocity has made necessary. It is hard to resist the conclusion that Chaucer here meant to attack the Host in his most vulnerable spot—as a henpecked husband. The Pilgrims could surely not have tarried at the Tabard Inn without having encountered the Hostess and her tempers. The "Tale of Melibeus," then, while told with all seriousness, and no doubt relished for its edification, was, I believe, selected by Chaucer partly because it afforded such an admirable opportunity for aiming at the Host under the cover of impeccable literary respectability. The poet probably had the treatise, whether in the original or in its present form, among his papers, so that it was all ready for insertion as a foil to "Sir Thopas" and a reply to the Host's gibes.<sup>1</sup> When Harry Baily exclaims sadly, at the close of his agonized reflections on his amazon consort,

But lat us passe away fro this matere—

Chaucer may well feel that he has tasted the sweets of revenge.

Analysis of Chaucer's humor is hazardous business. The elvisiveness of his fun, its very subtlety and delicacy, make it peculiarly difficult to define with certainty. Modern criticism may, as Lowes has intimated,<sup>2</sup> sometimes fall into the error of reading into Chaucer's work satirical intention which it does not possess. The preceding comments are offered with a full realization of this danger,

<sup>1</sup> Tatlock, *op. cit.*, dates the translation of the "Melibeus" as probably before 1394. He is inclined to put the composition of the Wife of Bath's Prologue still earlier, although the evidence, which is mainly *ex silentio*, is not very convincing. Chaucer must at least have read the "Melibeus" in the original before the composition of the Wife's Prologue and Tale; see discussion below. He obviously shifted his material about a great deal, so that the sequence of composition of the different stories may well differ a good deal from the arrangement which he later decided to give them. That the "Melibeus" was originally intended for the Man of Law, while entirely possible, seems to me pure hypothesis. The tale is indeed a series of arguments with formal appeal to authorities, but this was characteristic of many types of mediaeval literature, and is no particular evidence of a legal turn of mind. Most of the characters in the pilgrimage cite "auctoritees," when they depart from pure narrative. Nor does the fact that the Man of Law "deprecates comparison with Chaucer's mythological and poetic tales" (B 90 ff.; Tatlock, 197) mean that he must tell a story of the "Melibeus" type. Apologies of this sort were, of course, literary commonplaces; cf. the Franklin's Prologue with his performance. Moreover, is it not possible that Tatlock has mistaken the sense of l. 95? The pronoun *him* may well refer to *Metamorphoseos*, not to Chaucer. The whole introduction to the Man of Law's Prologue is a puzzling piece of work; the insertion of the list of Chaucer's works is not very deftly done, and looks like an afterthought. The evidence for connecting the "Melibeus" with the Man of Law could hardly be more tenuous.

<sup>2</sup> "Is Chaucer's Legend of Good Women a Travesty?" *Journal of English and German Philology*, VIII, 513 ff.



but with the conviction that they explain the introduction of the "Melibeus" at this point more satisfactorily than previous criticism has done. Whatever one may think of this explanation, which is in no way essential to the main thesis of this paper, he must admit certain facts about the "Melibeus" which are of the utmost importance in connection with the Marriage Group beginning with the Wife of Bath's Prologue.

In the "Tale of Melibeus" the theme—the *leit-motiv*, one might say—of conjugal "maistrie" or "sovereignty" is first clearly sounded.<sup>1</sup> Dame Prudence extricated her husband from his difficulties, because he gave up to her the ordering of his affairs. In the beginning, indeed, Melibeus is disinclined to do this.

This Melibee answerde un-to his wyf Prudence: "I purpose nat," quod he, "to werke by thy conseil, for many causes and resouns. For certes every wight wolde holde me thanne a fool; this is to seyn, if I, for thy conseilling, wolde chaungen thinges that been ordeyned and affermed by so manye wyse. Secoundly I seye, that alle wommen been wikke and noon good of hem alle. For 'Of a thousand men,' seith Salomon, 'I fond a good man: but certes, of alle wommen, good womman fond I never.' And also certes, if I governed me by thy conseil, it sholde seme that I hadde yewe to thee over me the maistrie; and god forbode that it so were. For Iesus Syrak seith; 'that if the wyf have maistrie, she is contrarious to hir housbonde.' And Salomon seith. . . ."

But Dame Prudence, with her skilled dialectic, proceeds to reason her husband out of his position, so that he ultimately gives in to her completely.

Wyf, by-cause of thy swete wordes, and eek for I have assayed and preved thy grete sapience and thy grete trouthe, I wol governe me by thy conseil in alle thing.

And later on he twice assures her of his complete subjection to her authority.<sup>2</sup>

This tale is in effect, then, a prose counterpart to the "Wife of Bath's Tale." In each story a wife, by employing arguments bolstered up by many appeals to authority, gets her husband to give her the say in their family affairs, and so extricates him from a position of embarrassment. The words of the Knight and the Loathly Lady might have come from the lips of Melibeus and Prudence:

<sup>1</sup> There is little if any suggestion of this theme in the tales preceding the "Melibeus." Such stories as those told by the Reeve or the Shipman, while incidentally satirizing marital relationships, do not discuss the question of the supremacy of husband or wife; see discussion below.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Skeat's ed., pp. 204, 207, 233, 234.

"My lady and my love, and wyf so dere,  
I put me in your wyse governance;  
\* \* \* \* \*

For as yow lyketh, it suffiseth me."

"Thanne have I gete of yow maistrye," quod she,

"Sin I may chese, and governe as me lest?"

"Ye, certes, wyf," quod he, "I holde it best."<sup>1</sup>

And the Wife's narrative, in her Prologue, of her fifth husband's annoying habit of citing authorities to prove the undesirability of women, and that "algates housbondes han sorwe," reminds us of the learned arguments of Melibeus to a similar end. Jankin's repertory is, however, infinitely larger. But it availed him naught, for ultimately, says Dame Alisoun,

He yaf me al the brydel in myn hond  
To han the governance of hous and lond,  
And of his tonge and of his hond also,  
And made him brenne his book anon right tho.  
And whan that I hadde geten un-to me,  
By maistrie, al the soveraynetee,

After that day we hadden never debaat.<sup>2</sup>

These resemblances are too striking to be accidental. It is impossible not to think there was a connection in Chaucer's mind between the situation in these two tales, and that if the Wife's Prologue and Tale opens the specific discussion of marriage, the "Melibeus" is the beginning of the remarks which prepare its way.

At the close of the Host's soliloquy on his shrewish wife, he turns to the Monk, and with coarse humor suggests that a man of religion may tell a tale at this point. If the Host were Pope, he would give the clergy wives. The views of the mediaeval church in regard to women were well known; the Host perhaps felt that a few satirical hits at the sex would ease his own lacerated sensibilities. Such a rejoinder from the Monk is doubly to be expected, since the Shipman, in his tale, has satirized the affection of a Monk for a faithless wife. But this elegant ecclesiastic proposes to be drawn into no such controversy, nor does he lose his temper over the Host's gibes, but takes all in patience. Instead of a continuation of the discussion at this juncture, then, we have the formal "tragedies" of the Monk,

<sup>1</sup> D 1230 ff.

<sup>2</sup> D 627 ff. For resemblances in plot and characterization between the "Melibeus" and the "Merchant's Tale," see Tatlock, *op. cit.*, p. 215.

just as later on, as Professor Kittredge has shown, the "comic interlude" of the Summoner and Friar interrupts the symposium on marriage. But our discussion is taken up once more by the Nun's Priest.

The Nun's Priest is a pilgrim of whom we would gladly know more. Few stories are more delightful than his, more rich in humor and descriptive felicity. But he is barely mentioned, along with two others, in the general Prologue, and there is little description of him in the transitional passage preceding his tale, save that he rides on a jade—"this swete preest, this goodly man, sir Iohn." The Epilogue to his tale is by no means free from suspicion of spuriousness—at least in the concluding couplet. The preceding lines are better, and if we may believe their evidence, the Nun's Priest is a man who, like the Monk,<sup>1</sup> would have been an avowed servant of Venus had he been secular. And he takes up the implied challenge of the "Tale of Melibeus," which the Monk has refused—or all but refused<sup>2</sup>—to notice. There is an added reason in his own case; he is subject to a lady who is his ecclesiastical superior. It is possible that he may not have relished being in the train of the elegant Prioress—along with the little dogs, as it were, and riding on an ill-favored nag, while they had fine bread and the best of attention. And so he tells a story which, as he himself puts it, is intended to illustrate the evil effects of trusting a wife.

My tale is of a cok, as ye may here,  
That took his counseil of his wyf, with sorwe,  
To walken in the yerd—

In short, the tale illustrates just the converse of the point made by the "Melibeus." If you put confidence in the advice of your wife you will come to grief. But this is not all. The Priest lets his feelings run away with him, and bursts out:

Wommennes counseils been ful ofte colde;  
Wommannes conseil broghte us first to wo,  
And made Adam from paradys to go,  
Ther-as he was ful mery, and wel at ese.

<sup>1</sup> Chaucer uses the same phrase in both descriptions; cf. B 3135 with 4641.

<sup>2</sup> It may be that the *exempla* of Adam and Eve, Sampson and his wives, and Hercules and Deianira, which the Wife of Bath's fifth husband used to prove the undesirability of women (D 710 ff.), are introduced by the Monk with malice aforethought.

Then, recollecting himself, and perhaps feeling the disapproving eyes of his lady mistress and the Wife of Bath fixed on him, he hastens to add:

But for I noot, to whom it mighte displese,  
If I counseil of wommen wolde blame,  
Passe over, for I seyde it in my game.  
Rede auctors, wher they trete of swiche matere,  
And what thay seyn of wommen ye may here.  
Thise been the cokkes wordes, and nat myne,  
I can noon harm of no womman divyne.<sup>1</sup>

He ends his tale in unobjectionable fashion, making it into a kind of *exemplum* on the evils of trusting flatterers. But he had no need to emphasize his point further. His bolt at the ladies had been shot.

Does not the exquisite appropriateness of this tale to the teller explain why the Nun's Priest is brought out of his obscurity at this juncture, and made to speak up, while the Yeoman and the Plowman, who interested Chaucer as personalities at the time he was writing the General Prologue, never get a chance to have their say at all? As Chaucer proceeded with the composition of the tales, and became interested in their dramatic contrasts and in the interplay of character among the Pilgrims, he sometimes found it advisable to draw the obscurer persons, like the Nun's Priest or the Second Nun, to the front, or even to introduce a new one, as the Canon's Yeoman. The reason why the Second Nun gets a tale seems clear. The poet first assigned the story to a male pilgrim, as has often been pointed out, then, perceiving that it was more suited to a woman, and having already provided the Prioress (perhaps the Wife of Bath need scarcely be mentioned) with a tale, he brought the Second Nun out of her obscurity, and gave St. Cecilia to her. In a similar way, realizing the humor of having a man in the service of a woman reply to the "Melibeus," he gave the Nun's Priest, a hitherto undistinguished member of the party, an eminence which few of the Pilgrims enjoy.

Did the Wife of Bath, who can hardly have listened<sup>2</sup> to this story with patience, have to wait until the Physician and the Pardoner

<sup>1</sup> Cf. B 4442 ff.

<sup>2</sup> It is obvious that all the pilgrims cannot be supposed to have heard the telling of any given tale. That nine and twenty persons riding along a fourteenth-century road, even so well-trodden a highway as that from London to Canterbury, could have heard the story-telling of one of their number, is, in the nature of things, impossible. It seems simplest, if we are to treat the pilgrimage realistically, to imagine them as riding in

had finished their tales before relieving her mind on the burning topic of "wo in mariage"? Are we to see in these two stories an "interlude" of another sort than that provided by the Summoner and the Friar? I think not. The evidence—based on other grounds than dramatic propriety—is clearly in favor of placing the Physician and Pardoner elsewhere, and allowing the Wife of Bath to follow the Nun's Priest without delay.

What the true sequence of the *Canterbury Tales* really is, if indeed there be any "true sequence" to find, will perhaps never be determined. The arrangements in the manuscripts differ widely; some are more satisfactory than others, but none is logically consistent with the internal evidence of the text. The same is true of early printed versions. It is generally agreed that these confusions, which affect different groups of stories rather than each story separately, are due to the probability that the *Canterbury Tales* were originally put forth in sections and that the scribes combined these sections in different ways when they copied them into a connected whole.<sup>1</sup> Within these sections, as determined by the manuscripts, and indicated by the Chaucer Society by the letters A to I (with a subdivision of the B-section into B<sup>1</sup> and B<sup>2</sup>), there is no doubt about the sequence. Therefore we may be sure that the order "Sir Thopas," "Melibeus," "Monk," and "Nun's Priest" is correct, since these all fall in B<sup>2</sup>. But the arrangement of Group C ("Physician" and "Pardoner") in relation to Group B and to Group D ("Wife of Bath," "Friar," and "Summoner") is not by any means clear.

Most modern arrangements are of course based upon allusions to place and time on the journey in the tales or in the links connecting the tales, or upon cross-references from one group of tales to another. Such internal evidence of final design on Chaucer's part ought, it appears, to be of more weight than the sequence even of the best manuscripts. Professor Tatlock, a most careful and judicious student of this matter, has summed up the situation as follows:

groups, and gathering about a teller as they were attracted by the story he had to offer. The Prioress and the Second Nun would probably have cared as little for the japes of the Reeve or the Miller as the latter would have for their delicate legends of the little clerkson or of St. Cecilia. It must be remembered, however, that despite the realism of the pilgrimage, there are conventions which the reader must accept, such as the metrical form of the tales, and that it is possible that the hearing of the stories by so large a company is to be accepted in a similar way.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Miss E. P. Hammond, "On the Order of the *Canterbury Tales*," *Modern Philology*, October, 1905, pp. 159 ff., and Chaucer, a *Bibliographical Manual*, New York, 1908, pp. 158 ff.

... I am so far from begging the question of a single authentic arrangement that I do not believe Chaucer ever put the poem together at all. But I do not see how we can doubt that he would have studied out the matter carefully had he lived to finish the work; that the mention of times and seasons, of places along the road, and of tales already told, indicates that he bore the subject in mind more or less all along; and that if we can devise an arrangement without serious inconsistencies, we are justified in preferring it to a self-contradictory one, and in accepting it as coming near Chaucer's<sup>1</sup> intention, even though the one be the arrangement of no manuscript, and the other that of many. To do otherwise, it seems to me, attributes to the poet a slovenliness, a carelessness, and even a lack of seriousness about his work quite beyond anything else we can attribute to him. If the arrangements of the MSS are illogical, it seems as easy to reject all as all but one. Such a logical arrangement as I have mentioned can be devised,<sup>2</sup> and is pretty much that of modern editions, which lacks definiteness only in that, Group C containing no note of Chaucer's intention, we cannot be sure where he would have put it had he arranged the poem at the stage it had reached when he died.

There appears to be a very general agreement among the later authorities who have studied the sequence of the various groups that C is misplaced, that it really does not belong between B and D at all. Skeat says: "I wish to make a note that the right order of the Groups is ABDEFCGHI."<sup>3</sup> Shipley, in what is perhaps the most thoroughgoing study of the problem ever made, argues for the order ACBDEFGHI.<sup>4</sup> This location of C was accepted by Dr. Furnivall. Some years previously, Fleay had made a suggestion to the same effect, which apparently passed unnoticed.

The weight of authority, then, on grounds not connected with the arguments in the present article, is all in favor of placing the Prologue of the "Wife of Bath" directly after the tale of the Nun's Priest. This heightens greatly the effectiveness of the Wife's Prologue, and affords an added reason for the vehemence of her language. But this arrangement is not absolutely necessary to our main contention. Unless it be denied that Group B comes earlier than Group D, we cannot fail to see a motivation for the Wife of Bath's utterances in the insults of the priest on the bony

<sup>1</sup> "The Harleian Manuscript 7334 and Revision of the *Canterbury Tales*," *Publications of the Chaucer Society*, 1909, for the issue of 1904, p. 26.

<sup>2</sup> From this point the sentence follows a footnote, p. 26. <sup>3</sup> *Oxford Chaucer*, III, 434.

<sup>4</sup> *Modern Language Notes*, X, 260 ff. (1895). A full discussion of this general subject, with bibliographical references, will be found in Miss Hammond's *Chaucer*; cf. note to p. 256. I therefore do not cite references in detail at this point. It may be observed that Shipley (*Modern Language Notes*, XI, 293) says: "Closer study has strengthened my former opinion" (i.e., in article in Vol. X).



nag who has flouted truths which she felt to be the ripest issue of her experience.

Chaucer apparently left unwritten the transitional passage which would have brought this out clearly, and would have linked closely the Wife's remarks with the preceding discussion, just as he left unfinished so much in the dramatic interlocking of the *Canterbury Tales*. In one sense, then, we must agree entirely with Professor Kittredge, that the formal connection with what precedes is lacking. But this appears relatively insignificant, when we look at the tales as a whole, and observe the relation of the Wife's utterances to the discussions of marriage which have gone before. Then we realize that there is a good reason, an adequate motivation, for this "long preamble of a tale."

In the hands of the Wife of Bath, the subject reaches truly epic proportions. Though very definitely indicated, the theme of "maistrie" or "sovereignty" in marriage had been brought out by Chaucer and the Host and the Nun's Priest only in connection with tales whose formal point was of another sort; here the whole interest revolves about it. We may, then, with Professor Kittredge, call the Wife's Prologue the beginning of the Marriage Group proper.<sup>1</sup> But its prelude should not be forgotten! At the close of the day's journey, Dame Alisoun could indeed have thought with satisfaction of her revenge on the Nun's Priest and those of his inclining, and say of them, as of her husbands,

For god it woot, I chidde hem spitously!

WILLIAM WITHERLE LAWRENCE

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

<sup>1</sup> Since the preceding article was written, Dr. John Koch has questioned the propriety of speaking of a "marriage group" in the *Canterbury Tales* at all, observing that the tales of the Miller, Shipman, and Manciple, with Chaucer's "Tale of Melibeus," which are not included within Professor Kittredge's division, treat of "das thema der ehe, den guten oder bösen einfluss der frau auf ihren gatten." It is perfectly true that the tales cited by Dr. Koch treat of marriage, more or less, but that (with the exception of the "Melibeus," sufficiently discussed above) the good or bad influence of a wife upon her husband is in the least emphasized as a theme of discussion can hardly be maintained. The debate as to which of the two, husband or wife, should enjoy the supremacy, is what gives unity to the Marriage Group and the tales of "Melibeus," Monk, and Nun's Priest preceding. It gives rise to debate among other pilgrims, and motivates the telling of various tales. Chaucer may at first have intended the "Shipman's Tale" for the Wife of Bath, and, as Tatlock conjectures, have seen in the Merchant a worthy antagonist for her (cf. *Development and Chronology*, p. 207). But in assigning it to the Shipman he gave it a place apart from the dramatic debate among the pilgrims which begins with the Host's snubbing of the teller of "Sir Thopas." It is absurd to object, as Koch does, to grouping certain tales around the discussion of a definite theme because the tales as a whole cannot be resolved into hard-baked sections. If one follows Koch's advice, and treats each story as a separate unit, he will miss much of the dramatic significance of the *Canterbury Tales*. For Koch's discussion, see *Engl. Studien*, xlv, 112f.



## THE SPANISH PROSE TRISTRAM SOURCE QUESTION

Almost simultaneously with my recent attempt to indicate an Italian origin for the Old Spanish romance of chivalry *Tristán de Leonís* and the still older *Cuento de Tristán*, preserved in the Vatican library, Señor Bonilla y San Martín brought out a new edition of the first-named work.<sup>1</sup> Inasmuch as the views expressed by Bonilla in his Introduction to this work are so different from my own results, I desire to reply to them and to indicate wherein it seems to me they are erroneous.

After having edited the third edition of the *Tristán de Leonís*, that of Juan Cromberger, Sevilla, 1528,<sup>2</sup> Bonilla now gives to the world the *editio princeps* of the same romance, reproducing the British Museum's unique exemplar of Juan de Burgos' edition, published in Valladolid, 1501. The text is more antiquated than that of the previously published third edition, and differs from it to a marked degree. The book is a sumptuous, even a luxurious, specimen of the printer's art. The text is illustrated with an introduction, notes, appendix, and alphabetical index of proper names.

In the first chapter of his Introduction, Bonilla does not profess to do more than give a convenient résumé of the work of Bédier, Golther, Röttiger, Jessie L. Weston, and others. Arthurian scholars will find here nothing new. In the second chapter, "La leyenda de Tristán en España," the editor takes up with much thoroughness the matter of allusions to Tristram, Iseult, and the whole Arthurian literature in early ballads, lyrics, and prose works. He adds not a little to what Menéndez y Pelayo had already written on the subject.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Northup, "The Italian Origin of the Spanish Prose Tristram Versions," *The Romanic Review*, Vol. III, pp. 194 ff.

*Libro del esforçado cauallero Don Tristan de Leonís y de sus grandes fechos en armas* (reprinted from the edition of Valladolid, 1501, edited by Bonilla y San Martín, Sociedad de bibliófilos madrileños, Madrid, 1912).

<sup>2</sup> Nueva bib. de aut. esp., Vol. VI, *Libros de caballerías* (ed. Bonilla y San Martín, Madrid, 1907).

<sup>3</sup> Menéndez y Pelayo, *Nueva bib. de aut. esp.*, Vol. I, *Orígenes de la novela* (Madrid, 1905), pp. clxix ff.

The conclusion that the allusions to Tristram in the early literature do not point to the prose romance that we know seems to be just. Bonilla is also correct in his opinion that the *Amadís de Gaula* is largely influenced by this romance which was first printed seven years earlier than Montalvo's Zaragoza edition of 1508. But the matter is here merely touched upon, and one could wish a more detailed study than either Bonilla or Miss Williams has made upon this point.

The chief question raised by the publication of this early romance of chivalry, and that which most concerns students of Arthurian literature is this: What is the relation of the *Tristán de Leonís* to the French Prose Romance and the various versions of it preserved in the Italian and other European vernaculars? This question Bonilla attempts to answer in his third chapter: "El Tristán castellano—sus fuentes." And here it is the writer's unpleasant duty to point out a capital fault in Bonilla's method, a defect so serious that it vitiates many of his conclusions and leads him into errors which might easily have been avoided. That fault is this: Bonilla has now twice edited this romance wholly without reference to the Vatican Tristram, a MS closely related, older, and in many respects more authentic. Thus to edit and annotate a text was bad enough; for the Vatican MS would have afforded a ready solution to many points which have perplexed him. But such a lack of scholarly conscience is doubly inexcusable in one who, like Bonilla, undertakes to solve complicated questions of source and manuscript relationship. He has in his possession a copy of the manuscript referred to.<sup>1</sup> This manuscript is the key to the question he attempts to solve; and yet he deliberately makes no use of it. Bonilla has faithfully exploited Curdy's bibliography. His footnotes teem with learned allusions to Bérout, Thomas, Gottfried von Strassburg, Eilhard von Oberg, the English *Sir Tristrem*, etc. Why has he gone so far afield for material while neglecting beyond the briefest mention the only other extensive Tristram version in his own language when a copy of that text was in his possession at the time?

First of all Bonilla makes the misleading statement that Vatican 6428 represents a version different from that which he is editing.

<sup>1</sup> Bonilla, *Tristán de Leonís*, p., xxxvii, note.

From this an uninitiated reader might infer that any comparison of the two versions was superfluous. It is true that the Vatican (V) and *Tristán de Leontis* (TL) are without much doubt independent translations and differ absolutely as to language; but, on the other hand they coincide very closely as regards both subject-matter and the order in which the various incidents are narrated. They are related intimately. Neither can V be studied apart from TL nor TL apart from V without disastrous result. After having disposed of the Vatican MS with the briefest of mention (six lines of text and five of notes) Bonilla proceeds to compare TL with the French MSS as analyzed by Löseth.<sup>1</sup> The first conclusion reached is obvious and unassailable: that TL coincides with none of the known French texts. Don Adolfo is apparently unaware that Baist had reached the same conclusion some years ago.<sup>2</sup> To support this conclusion Bonilla next proceeds to instance 24 peculiar traits found in TL and lacking in the French. Of course, he cites only a few of the more salient points. He might have instanced many more. Now it may well be asked, would it not have been illuminating if Bonilla had pointed out that of the 24 traits instanced V shares 21, those lettered: A, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O, Q, R, RR, S, T, U, V? And was this not also the place to indicate that nearly all these same peculiarities are to be found in some or all of the MSS belonging to the Italian group? Owing to his failure to indicate these facts the uncritical reader will form the opinion that TL is a version almost unique in its peculiarities, which is far from being the fact.

Bonilla has not, to be sure, utterly neglected to notice certain peculiarities which the *Tavola Ritonda* and the *Tristano Riccardiano* have in common with TL. But his discussion of this matter is most summary. He calls attention to only a few of the distinctive traits which the Italian and Spanish versions have in common in opposition to the French, leaving upon the reader's mind the impression that the similarity between these texts is not very great after all. Had Bonilla not avoided the weeks of drudgery necessary to make a thorough comparison of the long texts in question, he might have pointed out hundreds of common traits whereas he has indicated only

<sup>1</sup> Löseth, *Le roman en prose de Tristan*, etc. (Paris, 1890).

<sup>2</sup> Baist, "Die spanische Litteratur," *Gröbers Grundriss*, III, 5, p. 438.

a scant dozen. And had he realized the full importance of the Vatican MS and carefully collated all four versions, he would not so have underestimated the importance of the Italian redactions. Because the similarity between the Riccardiano (R) and V is even more apparent than is that of R and TL. TL, as a later text which was revised for the press, has undergone far more revision than V. The many MSS closely related to R are not so much as mentioned. Yet one of these, Panciatichiano 33 (P), in the opinion of the present writer, stands in a very close relationship to the Spanish versions.

What then are Bonilla's opinions with regard to the source of TL? He agrees with Baist and the present writer in saying that TL is unlike any one of the existing French versions. He agrees with me also in discrediting the statement found in the Prologue of TL to the effect that it was translated from the French of Philippe Camus.<sup>1</sup> He admits that two (but why two only?) of the Italian versions offer striking points of similarity with the Spanish when the latter diverge from the French models, though the superficiality of his investigations has kept him from realizing the full import of their agreement. But having admitted this, he claims most illogically that TL descends directly from the French (whose extant texts it does not resemble) rather than from the Italian (whose extant texts it resembles very closely). To account for even the few similarities he has found between Spanish and Italian he is forced to posit a French "model" (he avoids the term source) from which both Spanish and Italian versions were copied. I submit that such a theory is less plausible than my own: that the two Spanish versions spring directly from lost Italian originals closely akin to those preserved. In the first place the mere fact that one of the Spanish versions has been preserved in an Italian library in itself creates a presumption that there was some interchange of Tristram MSS between Italy and Spain. Many of the peculiarities common to both Italian and Spanish are errors made in the process of translation. Would an Italian and a Spaniard, rendering out of the same French MS or related French MSS, each independently into his own vernacular, make identical errors? In my former study I have shown that, as a whole, the Italian versions are more faithful to the French than are the Spanish.

<sup>1</sup> Bonilla, *op. cit.*, pp. 387 ff.

Lastly a few forms which appear to be Italianisms have crept into the Spanish versions.

Another proof of Italian origin, which I have not previously used, is the fact that where the Spanish versions V and TL disagree a reason for the disagreement may sometimes be found in the Italian versions. That is to say, V will coincide in a mistake with one group of Italian MSS, TL with another. Thus, R and V agree in substituting Godoine for the Andret of the French, whereas the Tavola Ritonda (S) and TL incline toward Andret. Nevertheless, TL and one MS of S show the same substitution of Godoine on the single occasion when this variously styled traitor is first introduced. Again, in P and V, Tristram ends a duel, by himself asking the Lady of the Thorn to settle the dispute. Now TL agrees with three other Italian MSS, S, F, L, where Tristram's opponent Blanore makes the suggestion instead of Tristram. When Tristram is about to fight a duel with Morhout, Gaheriet intercedes for Tristram in V and R. The trait is omitted in TL and S. R and V omit the prayer which Brangen makes when about to be killed by the serfs; S and TL have it. R has *Lamoratto di Gaunes*, corresponding to *Lamarad de Gaones* in TL; V has *de Gales* corresponding to *Di Gaules* of P. When Tristram fights with *Lamarad* and his cousin, R and V agree in making the first fight to be between Tristram and his cousin. In TL and S, Tristram first fights with *Lamarad* and afterward with the cousin. These few instances out of many will, I think, make clear my point that discrepancies between the Spanish versions often correspond to identical discrepancies within the Italian group.

I now desire to take up a few points which have given Bonilla difficulty in the present edition and to indicate how easily they may be accounted for on the theory of a direct Italian origin.

1. Bonilla shows that where the French versions have the name *Felix*, TL has *Felipe*. Now was it not easier to derive *Felipe* from Italian *Felice* than directly from *Felix*? Bonilla does not attempt to explain the name *Desierto De Fecilate*. I suspect that this last word represents Italian *Felicitate*. MS P shows the same metathesis of *c* and *l* when it gives *Fecile* as a variant of *Felice*.

2. Bonilla seems to connect Giosa Guarda with the Galician *goyosa*.<sup>1</sup> I submit that my explanation is the more plausible—that it represents a shortening of Italian *Gioiosa*.

3. The proper name Echides puzzles Bonilla. He notes that R substitutes Ghedin for the French Andret and mentions the variant Kedin, failing to notice much closer Italian variants such as Ghidin, Ghedis, Chedin. In V we have Godis. Thus in two closely related Spanish texts we have a *g* in the one name corresponding to a *ch* in the other. Now such an interchange (graphic rather than phonetic) existed in the cortonese-umbro dialect MSS in which R and some of the other variant MSS are written. I refrain from giving similar instances in a host of other proper names.

4. Bonilla compares a passage from French MS 103 to prove that at that point the author of the Spanish version was not translating but arranging freely.<sup>2</sup> If instead of this one comparison, the reader will take the trouble to compare this passage with the corresponding passages in V and the various Italian versions, he will obtain evidence that many of the traits in the TL passage have their analogues in the other versions and that the scribe who wrote TL while he may not have translated literally was at least not inventing.

5. Bonilla calls attention to the fact that in the French the serfs commissioned to slay Brangen kill a dog and dip her garments in its blood. In TL they slay instead a *cabrón*; in V, a *cabrito*. In the Italian (R) they kill a beast, what kind is unspecified. This trait is illustrative of a principle which applies in scores of other cases: that where there is a marked difference between French and Spanish, the Italian offers an intermediary stage.

Bonilla has not failed to perceive that Rusticien de Pise is also a source for a small portion of TL. In his final statement regarding the source of TL he advances two possibilities: (a) that there were two sources, (1) a French version of the first part of the Prose Romance of Tristram, and (2) Rusticien de Pise; (b) that the Spanish translator utilized a French source in which the work of Rusticien was already incorporated.

<sup>1</sup> Bonilla, *op. cit.*, p. xxviii, note.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. liv.

The present writer believes, on the contrary, that the Spanish translator of TL had as his source an Italian version of the prose romance in which the work of Rusticien was already incorporated. Bonilla has failed to notice that such a union of the two sources obtains in the case of the *Tristano di Viena*, one of the important MSS of the Italian group. To support his view he says:<sup>1</sup> "Apparently the compiler of the Riccardiano did not know the compilation of Rusticien de Pise." But by neglecting to inform the reader that R is a fragment he produces a wrong impression. The missing conclusion of R may or may not have drawn from Rusticien like TL and the *Tristano di Viena*. I have previously noted one form, taken from the latter part of TL, which adds to my belief that that portion, too, is of Italian origin: Vercepon (TL) corresponding to Verzeppo (P) and Verzeppo, Verzeppe (S) instead of the correct French form Louvezerp, Lonnezerp, etc.

In conclusion I will say that the analogies which Bonilla has noted between R and TL and which he styles *extraordinariamente curiosas* are not curious at all, but wholly natural, to one who accepts my view that V and TL are directly derived from the Italian. They are indeed extraordinary if one holds with Bonilla that the direct source was French. We may expect new light on this subject when Bonilla publishes his eagerly awaited "History of the Romances of Chivalry." The writer is confident that a fuller study of the related versions will compel him materially to alter his views.

GEORGE TYLER NORTHUP

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. lviii.





## NOTE ON HUMAN AUTOMATA

In his very interesting and scholarly study of "Human Automata in Classical Tradition and Mediaeval Romance," which appeared in *Modern Philology* in the April number of the current year, Professor J. Douglas Bruce cites (p. 3) the following passage from Plato's *Euthyphro* (11 B): Socrates says: "Your words, Euthyphro, are like the handiwork of my ancestor Daedalus; and if I were the sayer or propounder of them, you might say that this comes of my being his relation and that this is the reason why my arguments walk away and won't remain fixed where they are placed."

Dr. Bruce looks upon this passage as an allusion to automata fashioned by the mythical sculptor Daedalus, and also cites a similar one from the *Meno* (97 D), which runs: "They [the images of Daedalus] require to be fastened in order to keep them, and if they are not fastened, they will play truant and run away."

I might add that the same thought appears a second time, in the *Euthyphro* (15 D), and that the allusion in the *Meno* is explained by the scholiast thus (p. 367): "Daedalus . . . was the first to open the eyes of his statues, so that they seemed to see, and to separate the feet so that they seemed to walk. And on account of this they were bound, that they might not escape, as if they had long been alive."

The account of this wonderful statuary is repeated with variations by many ancient writers from Euripides in the fifth century B.C., to Tzetzes in the twelfth A.D.<sup>1</sup> The best description of the marvelous works of Daedalus is found in the following passage from Diodorus Siculus (iv. 76 f. 8): "And in the sculptor's art he so far excelled all other men that in after-times the fable was told of him that the

<sup>1</sup> I herewith mention in chronological order some of the more important references: Euripides (*Hecuba*, vs. 836-38; and cf. the scholiast to the passage, who quotes a fragment of the poet's lost play *Eurytheus*, which runs: "The Daedalian statues all seem to move and to see"); Palaephatus (*De Incredibil.* 22); Zenobius (*Prov.* iii); Dion Chrysostomus (*Orat.* 37. 9); Callistratus (*Stat.* 8); Philostratus (*Imag.* i. 16 and *Vita Apoll.* i. vi. 3); Themistius (*Orat.* xv, p. 316a); the scholiast to Lucian (*Philops.* 19; and cf. the scholiast to Plato's *Euthyphro*, p. 328); Hesychius (s.v. *Αὐτάματα*); Suidas (s.v. *αὐτάματ' ἀνθρώπων*); Tzetzes (*Chil.*, I. 539 f.). All these references are collected in J. Overbeck's *Die Antiken Schriftquellen zur Geschichte der bildenden Künste bei den Griechen* (Leipzig, 1868), §§ 110-42.

statues which he made were like living beings; for they saw and walked, and, in a word, exercised every bodily function, so that his handiwork seemed to be a living person. And being the first to give them open eyes and parted legs and outstretched arms, he justly won the admiration of men; for before his time artists made statues with closed eyes, and hands hanging down and cleaving to their sides."

It would hardly seem, then, that the passage quoted by Dr. Bruce from Plato can refer to automata. The name "Daedalus" (from *δαίδαλλω*) merely means the "cunning worker," and belongs to an artificer-god or some human magician, and connotes skill in handicraft—whether in wood, ivory, or metal; in later times for some reason it was restricted to skill in sculpture. Thus the name is merely an impersonation of primitive Greek sculpture, and covers the transition from the early rigid and lifeless representations of gods and men in wood, to the archaic stone images known in the history of Greek art as "Apollos," which looked lifelike by comparison. The stories told of his ability have no historic value; they merely represent the uncritical notions of late writers, who thus tried to explain the early advances in the glyptic art. To them Daedalus was a historical sculptor, who was the first to break with the older canons, by opening the eyes of his statues, and freeing their arms from their sides and making their legs astride.

WALTER WOODBURN HYDE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

## THE READING OF AN ELIZABETHAN YOUTH

In 1614 Robert Ashley, a resident of the Middle Temple, and the author of several translations from nearly as many different modern languages,<sup>1</sup> set down in Latin a brief review of his own life. This autobiography is preserved in Sloane MS 2131 of the British Museum, and has, so far as I can learn, never been printed.<sup>2</sup> It contains, besides a few details on his education, an account of his early tastes in books, which, in view of the scarcity of published documents throwing light on the habitual reading of Englishmen in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, may perhaps interest students of the period.

Ashley grew up during the stirring years of Elizabeth's early reign, and in a class of society which felt to the full the varied influences of the time, intellectual as well as political. He was born in 1565, in the little Wiltshire village of Domerham, about seven miles from Salisbury, on the borders of Dorsetshire and Hampshire.<sup>3</sup> His father was a member of an old knightly family settled in Dorsetshire; his mother, whom he describes as a woman "elegantem, liberorum educationi, ac domesticæ curæ deditissimam,"<sup>4</sup> came from Somersetshire. It was to her encouragement chiefly that he owed his education.<sup>5</sup> His first instructions he received in the village school of Domerham. The master, however, proved to be unsatisfactory, and after a short time the lad was withdrawn and placed in charge of a tutor ("vir modestus ac satis eruditus") fresh from Oxford, with whom he remained until his tenth year, accompanying him to the Isle of Wight and later to Wimborne Minster in

<sup>1</sup> A partial list of these translations is given in the article on Ashley in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, II (1885), 172.

<sup>2</sup> It occupies folios 16-19r. Until recently it was catalogued as Addit. MS 2105. The title is *Vita R. A. ab ipso conscripta*; and the concluding sentence contains the following phrase, which establishes the date: "9 Mali anno Domini 1614 ætatis mæ [sic] 49." The document was used by James Mew in preparing the article on Ashley cited above, which, however, deals only in the most summary way with his early life.

<sup>3</sup> *Vita*, f. 16.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> "Siquidem sollicita matris ac provida industria pro liberorum educatione patris incuriam supplebat."—*Ibid.*, f. 17.

Dorsetshire, in order that he might complete all of his early work under the same teacher.<sup>1</sup> Between his tenth and his fifteenth year he was in no less than three schools, among them the grammar school at Southampton, then under the direction of the Flemish scholar and divine Adrian à Saravia.<sup>2</sup> At fifteen, after another period of tutoring, he went up to Oxford.<sup>3</sup>

Of the nature of his studies during these early years he gives but few indications. Yet these few are perhaps worth noting. While in Southampton he learned French by living in company with fifteen or twenty other boys of gentle birth in the household of his master, where on pain of wearing a fool's cap at meals they were allowed to speak no English.<sup>4</sup> Here also he improved his Latin, and studied Greek.<sup>5</sup> Again, in at least two schools, he took part in the comedies with which the students helped to celebrate Christmas or to entertain some member of the nobility who happened to be stopping in the neighborhood.<sup>6</sup>

On the subject of his private reading he is happily more circumstantial. After carrying the story of his life to his twentieth year, he turns aside to speak of his early interests in books. I give the passage in full.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Vita*, f. 16v.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 17. On Saravia see *D.N.B.*, L (1897), 299-301; and Foster Watson, *The Beginnings of the Teaching of Modern Subjects in England* (1909), pp. 396-97. "Another of Saravia's pupils about the same time was Joshua Sylvester, the translator of Du Bartas."—Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 396.

<sup>3</sup> *Vita*, f. 17v.

<sup>4</sup> "Ibi in praeceptoris domo Hadriani Saraviae Belgae cuius uxor et familia gallico sermone utebatur sexdecim aut viginti adolescentes nobiles enutriti gallice velut in Gallia degeremus domi familiariter loquebamur ea lege vt quis vernaculo sermone in domo vteretur deprehensus, is in refectorio tempore refectionis motionis capitali eoque vestiretur donec in alium eodem crimine deprehensum coronam sive cucullam suam transferret."—*Ibid.*, f. 17. This is one of the very few cases in which French was taught in an English grammar school of the late sixteenth century. See Watson, *op. cit.*, pp. 395-96.

<sup>5</sup> "Hic latinae linguae solidiora fundamenta leci, styli singulis hebdomadis exercui, soluta et numerosa oratione, Ovidii, Tullii ac Terentii facilitatem ac elegantiam quam affectabam pro meo puerili modulo ac tenuitate expressi, ac in Graece linguae rudimentis addiscendis non invulter operam posui."—*Vita*, f. 17.

<sup>6</sup> "Ibi [a school in the Isle of Purbeck] etiam cum in feriis Natalitii Redemptoris nostri celebrandis comedia inter nos actitanda esset principes eius partes quae illi ante comisse fuerant mihi postea per magistrum delegatae qua gloriola fortasse mihi nimium placui."—*Ibid.* And again: "Is [the master of a school at Salisbury which he attended in his twelfth year] ingeniorum haud segniter aestimator currenti praeconis suis calcar addidit, et cum comediae recitandae ac alla solennia spectacula coram Illustrissimo Henrico Comite Pembroke (qui tunc in vicinis habitabat) exhibenda essent mihi primas partes demandavit."—*Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 18. This passage, as well as the others quoted in this article, was transcribed for me by Miss Mary T. Martin.

Decimonono completo ac vicesimo aetatis anno inchoante in sodalium Collegii Magdalenensis cooptatus sum et sequenti anno confirmatus. Hic mei iuris factus estimare non potui quantum pretiosi temporis invtilius librorum lectiones aliena studia officiosae aliorum adolescentum visitationes itinera rusticationes mihi surriperent. Memini me dum puer essem licet magistri me in officio continerent, si forte in manus meas incideret libellus aliquis qui fictas et futiles fabellas contineret qualia de Bevisio Hamtonensi Guidone Warwicensi historia Valentini et Orsoni vita Arthuri Regis Britanniae et equitum orbicularis mensae<sup>1</sup> circumferuntur, ac huiusmodi portentis ac monstis qualia aut nunquam extiterunt, aut certe supra omnem fidem futilia ac vana per otiosos monachos de eis addita (ad irretiendam plebeculam et voluptate inescandam conficta in superiore seculo) ad nos pervenere,<sup>2</sup> teneri non potuisse quin tempus ludo somno cibationi imo ipsis studiis ac occupationibus seriis surreptum, in heorum istorum ingentibus factis armis, armoribus ac huiusmodi naeniis perlegendis collocarem. Liber iam animus pertaesur horum vt vulgarium et puerilium collectamentorum eorum loco linguarum exoticarum notitia substituerat Bocacii decameronem et octameronem Reginae Navarrae quod nihil aliud erat quam diabolium eicere molestum vt alium vel deteriorem admitterem et puerilia oblectamenta amandare vt adolescentiae corruptelas introducerem.

RONALD S. CRANE

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

<sup>1</sup> William Copland, who was active as a printer between 1548 and 1568 (Duff, *A Century of the English Book Trade* [1905], pp. 32-33), brought out editions of all four of these romances: *Syr Beuys of Hampton*, n.d. (B.M., C. 21. c. 62); *The Books of the moste victorious Prynce, Guy of Warwick*, n.d. (B.M., C. 21. c. 68); *The Hystory of the two valyaunte Brethren Valentyne and Orson, sonnes unto the Emperour of Greece*, n.d. (B.M., C. 34. i. 17); *The story of the most noble and worthy Kyngs Arthur* . . . , 1557 (B.M., C. 12. b. 12).

<sup>2</sup> This would appear to have been the usual view of the mediaeval romances held by Protestant writers in the sixteenth century. Cf., for example, Ascham, *Toxophilus* (1545), *English Works*, ed. Wright, 1904, pp. xiv-xv: "In our fathers tyme nothing was red, but bookes of fayned cheualrie. . . . These bokes (as I haue heard say) were made the moste parte in Abbayes, and Monasteries, a very Eekely and fit fruite of suche an ydle and blynde kinde of lyuyng"; *The Scholemaster* (1570), *ibid.*, pp. 230-31: "In our forefathers tyme, whan Papistrie, as a standyng poole, couered and ouerflowed all England, fewe bookes were read in our tong, sauynge certayne bookes of Cheualrie, as they sayd, for pastime and pleasure, which, as some say, were made in Monasteries, by idle Monkes, or wanton Chanons: as one for example, *Morie Arthurs* . . ."; Nashe, *The Anatomie of Absurditie* (1589), *Works*, ed. McKerrow, I (1904), 11: ". . . the fantasticall dreames of those exiled Abbie-lubbers, from whose idle pens proceeded those worne out impressions of the fayned no where acts, of Arthur of the rounde table, Arthur of little Brittain, sir Tristram, Hewon of Burdeaux, the Squire of low degree, the foure sons of Amon, with infinite others." It is not impossible that Ashley's later opinion of the romances, as well as his manner of expressing it, was colored somewhat by his reading of passages such as these.





## THE SOURCE OF RALPH ROISTER DOISTER

That Udall borrowed for *Roister Doister* certain lines from the *Miles Gloriosus* has long been known, but attempts to make out a more considerable debt have failed. The two plays are, as shown by Professor D. L. Maulsby,<sup>1</sup> utterly unlike in plot; and in structure *Roister Doister* is far above the *Miles Gloriosus*, which is nearly, if not quite, the poorest in construction of all Latin comedies.<sup>2</sup> It is unlikely that Udall would have selected such a play for a model, and, if he had, it would not have helped him. If we look at the characterization, the result is much the same. It has often been noticed that Plautus' Artotrogus is not a satisfactory source for Merygreeke, since he appears only once and has no share in the action of the *Miles Gloriosus*.<sup>3</sup> What has not been noticed is that the complete dependence of the braggart on the parasite, as in *Roister Doister*, is not characteristic of a single braggart soldier in any comedy of Plautus.<sup>4</sup> Since the relations and inter-play between Ralph and Merygreeke are the essential feature of *Roister Doister*, it is clear that Udall did not start from the *Miles Gloriosus*, nor indeed from any play of Plautus.

Because of Udall's well-known *Floures for Latine Spekynges*<sup>5</sup> selected from the first three comedies of Terence in 1534, one naturally

<sup>1</sup> David Lee Maulsby, "The Relation between Udall's *Roister Doister* and the Comedies of Plautus and Terence," *Englische Studien*, 1907, pp. 253-56. Richard Faust, *Das erste englische Lustspiel in seiner Abhängigkeit vom Moral-play und von der römischen Komödie*, Dresden, 1889, pp. 12-13.

<sup>2</sup> The first act discloses nothing of the dramatic situation, contains no action, and fails to inform us of the existence of any characters except the soldier and the parasite, the latter of whom is not heard of thereafter. The second act is wasted on a complication that produces no effect in the subsequent action. The third and fourth acts begin and end the main plot, and are followed by a fifth act consisting of a single scene of horseplay.

<sup>3</sup> Faust, 10-11, 14-15; Herman Graf, *Der Miles Gloriosus im englischen Drama*, Moscow, 1892, pp. 26-27; Ottomar Habersang, *Nicholas Udalls Ralph Royster Doyster*, Lüneburg, 1893, pp. 6-7.

<sup>4</sup> In the *Bacchides* and the *Asinaria* there are parasites in addition to the soldiers, but in each play the pair appears only once, and is of small importance in the action. In the *Aurelianus*, the *Truculentus*, and the *Poenulus*, there is no attendant parasite. Nowhere does the parasite have an active part in the intrigue of any braggart soldier.

<sup>5</sup> William Thomas Lowndes, *The Bibliographer's Manual of English Literature*, London, 1865, pp. 2607-8. In the enlarged edition of the *Floures* by I. Higgins (London, 1881), it is stated that Udall's selections were from the first three comedies only.

looks to Terence for a source, and to the *Eunuchus* in particular, since it was, of course, one of the first three comedies,<sup>1</sup> and since it has been recognized that certain lines in *Roister Doister* are adapted from this play in the same way in which others are taken from the *Miles Gloriosus*. In addition to this, two scenes of *Roister Doister* are clearly imitations of scenes in the *Eunuchus*: namely, the attack on Custance's house<sup>2</sup> and the reconciliation<sup>3</sup> at the end of the play. In both these instances is found a source for action, not, as in the lines borrowed from Plautus, merely for characterization. What I wish to point out is that the resemblances between *Roister Doister* and the *Eunuchus* are not confined to these passages, but extend to a general similarity in the outline of the two plots.

In the *Eunuchus*, a braggart soldier, Thraso, seeks the favors of a courtesan, Thais, who is faithful to a young man, Phaedria. Thais, however, learning that Thraso has purchased a young girl, Pamphila, who had been reared as a foundling in her home before Thais came to Athens, and, furthermore, believing Pamphila to be of Athenian birth, wishes to secure her from Thraso in order to restore her to her family. For this reason she sends Phaedria temporarily to the country so that she may be left free to cajole Thraso into giving her the girl. Thraso, emboldened by the accepted lover's absence, assiduously endeavors by presents and entertainment to regain his position with Thais. He gets into difficulties, however, by his stupidity in following the advice of his parasite, Gnatho, and thereupon falls into a rage, assaults the house of Thais, and ultimately retires only in time to avoid a fate similar to Ralph's. Upon the return of Phaedria, Thraso finds his affairs in a hopeless state, and casts himself once more into the hands of Gnatho, who arranges a reconciliation on terms that leave Thraso's vanity unimpaired.

Now the framework of the intrigue in *Roister Doister* is not more complicated than this under-plot of Terence's play. Indeed the simplicity of Udall's plot, together with the fact that his scene is before a single house, not before two houses, as regularly in Latin

<sup>1</sup> The traditional order in early editions of Terence was: *Andria*, *Eunuchus*, *Heautontimoroumenos*, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Mauleby, 258-65; Habersang, 7.

<sup>3</sup> Habersang, 7; Professor Ewald Flügel in Gayley's *Representative English Comedies*, 1907, pp. 102, 181-82.

comedy, has been adduced as an indication that Udall did not use any Latin comedy as a source except for the suggestion of details and for a general influence on his dramatic technique.<sup>1</sup> An equally reasonable explanation is that Udall used only one of the interwoven plots in his Latin source. The difficulty of finding a Latin comedy free enough in both plots from essential grossness to render it suitable for adaptation into an English school-play would naturally have led him to such a course. In the *Eunuchus* the main plot is entirely unsuited to Udall's stage, but the under-plot differs from the usual meretrix-intrigue in just the respects that determine its acceptability to English taste. I think this will be seen when I shall have considered the characterization; first I wish to compare the plots of Udall and of Terence.

In both plays a braggart attempts, during the absence of an accepted lover, to win the favor of a lady. In his efforts he relies completely on the counsel of his parasite; when that fails to bring success, he falls into a rage, and attacks the lady's house, without bettering his position. When the accepted lover returns, the braggart is discomfited, and, realizing his failure, gives up, but is reconciled with his opponents through the machinations of his parasite, who thereby improves his own condition in the world. This statement takes in the essentials of both plots; they are, in outline, identical. It is not surprising that only two of Udall's incidents correspond strikingly to the incidents of the *Eunuchus*, for Terence uses the soldier-plot merely for dramatic complication and relief, and does not develop it by action except in the attack and the reconciliation; elsewhere it is scarcely separable from the main plot, which Udall had cast aside.

There are, however, still other points at which reference to the *Eunuchus* is apparent. In the first act Phaedria is resentful because he thinks Thais has abandoned him in favor of the soldier, and he is staunchly supported in this by his servant, Parmeno; at last he is convinced by Thais that she is acting in good faith. This corresponds in situation, though not in dialogue, to the scene in *Roister Doister* in which Goodluck and Suresby are shown in a similar state

<sup>1</sup> Professor Clarence Griffin Child, *Ralph Roister Doister*, The Riverside Literature Series, 1912, p. 44.

of mind regarding the fidelity of Custance.<sup>1</sup> Again, the soliloquy in which Thais makes known her loyalty to Phaedria is not unlike the lament of Custance, when she fears the consequences of Goodluck's suspicions.<sup>2</sup> Also, the two plots are introduced alike by long monologues explaining the parasite's methods; in both there is the same buoyant self-confidence, and the same policy is outlined, which we have shown to be different from the usual rôle of the parasite, and resemblances of phrase are not hard to find. Finally, there is some refutation to the assertion that Merygreeke's tendency to work mischievously against, as well as for, his patron is entirely without suggestion in Latin Comedy; for in the last scene of the *Eunuchus* Gnatho assures Phaedria that he has been directing Thraso's campaign in such a way as to advance his own ambition to attach himself to Phaedria.<sup>3</sup> This is not so good-naturedly humorous as Merygreeke's explanation, but it shows kinship between the parasites of Udall and Terence.

Inasmuch as the action of *Roister Doister* proceeds from the activities of Merygreeke, it is of first importance to explain his

<sup>1</sup> *Terenti Comoediae*, ed. R. Y. Tyrrell, Oxford, 1902: *Eunuchus*, II. 46-80; Gayley's *Representative English Comedies*, R.R.D., V. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Eun.* II. 197-201:

THAIS: me miseram, forsitan mi hic parvam habeat fidem  
atque ex aliarum ingenis nunc me iudicet.  
ego pol. quae mihi sum conscia, hoc certo scio,  
neque me finxisse falsi quicquam neque meo  
cordi esse quemquam cariorum hoc Phaedria.

R.R.D., V. 3, 1-6:

C. CUSTANCE: O Lorde, how necessarie it is nowe of dayes,  
That eche bodie live uprightly all maner wayes,  
For lette never so little the gappe be open,  
And be sure of this, the worst shall be spoken.  
How innocent stande I in this dedde or thought,  
And yet see what mistrust towardes me it hath wrought.

<sup>3</sup> *Eun.*, II. 1069-71:

GNATHO: principio ego vos credere ambos hos mihi vehementer velim,  
me hulus quidquid facio id facere maxime causa mea.  
verum idem si vobis prodest, vos non facere incitasti.

II. 1084-5: recte facitis: unum hoc vos oro ut me in vostrum gregem  
recipiat: satis diu hoc jam saxum vorso.

R.R.D., IV. 6, 8-12:

M. MERY: Why do ye thinke dame Custance

That in this wowinge I have ment but pastance?

V. 5, 38-40: GA. GOODL: I beseeche your mashyp to take payne and suppes  
with us.

M. MERY: He shall not say you nay, and I too by Jesus.

The lines, *Eun.* 1069-70, are quoted by Professor Flügel to show "the vulgar, and almost uninteresting selfishness of Gnatho." It should be remembered that Gnatho must convince Phaedria that his intercession is not purely in favor of Thraso, his enemy. The words should not be regarded as the self-revelation of an utterly hard and selfish character, but as a part of the Renard-like plausibility which characterizes Merygreeke and Gnatho alike; neither can be justified on strictly ethical grounds.

characterization in testing a possible source. Accordingly, it has been shown that Merygreeke is derived from the *Eunuchus*, or from no Latin comedy. As for the other main characters, Ralph is, at the most cautious estimate, at least as much like Thraso as Pyrgopolinices. Indeed it is not without significance that most of the lines borrowed from Plautus, especially those lines which are most swollen with exaggeration, are transferred by Udall to the mouth of the flattering Merygreeke, whether they were spoken in the *Miles Gloriosus* by the soldier or the parasite. Ralph is not really a braggart; he has not the extravagant imagination characteristic of the Plautine soldier. He is, rather, "an easy comical figure," as Colman described the Terentian Thraso—a complacently conceited gull, rather than a blustering swaggerer and teller of "monstrous lies." It seems strange that one ever should have failed to distinguish these braggart types, or to recognize Ralph as unquestionably Terentian.

Beyond these two figures, soldier and parasite, no one has attempted to account for Udall's characterization by a literary source. Custance, Goodluck, and the others are English persons contemporary with Udall, just as Ralph and Merygreeke are, to less extent; they owe far less to Latin comedy than the two leading characters. But it is noteworthy that there is no grave discordance between Udall's characters and Terence's. Thais is not the usual *meretrix* of comedy; Donatus recognized the innovation made by Terence in Thais, and praised his skill in making a "good courtesan" without destroying the interest of the play.<sup>1</sup> Thais is always true to Phaedria, dignified in bearing, firm but not rude to her servants, generous in affection for Pamphila, tactful and able in identifying the young girl's family; and at the end of the play, Phaedria's father openly accepts her as his son's mistress, a position as near marriage as was permissible under the Athenian laws regarding the union of citizens and aliens. Phaedria, moreover, is not the usual wild youth of Latin comedy (that rôle is filled by his brother, Chaerea), but is almost as steady and colorless as Goodluck.

<sup>1</sup> Donatus on line 198 of the *Eunuchus* (cf. note 2, p. 276): "Atque ex alliarum ingentis nunc me iudicet": hic Terentius ostendit virtutis suae hoc esse, ut pervulgatas personas nove inducat et tamen a consuetudine non recedat, ut puta, meretricem bonam cum facit capiat tamen et delectet animum spectatoris."

For these reasons I believe that Udall selected as the basis of his English comedy the Thraso-plot of the *Eunuchus*. That he should do so was natural in view of his known interest in Terence and his recent translations from that particular play. The plot, moreover, is simple, of a nature that readily admits expansion by the insertion of incidents, and that requires little extenuation to adapt it for the school-stage. In the *Eunuchus*, he found one of the few completely drawn women of Latin comedy free from undesirable qualities; and in that play alone could he have found well developed the braggart-parasite pair, whose comic possibilities he so fully realized. His intimate acquaintance with all Latin comedy is attested by the ease with which he employs its devices no less than by the frequency with which he inserts little touches from other plays than his main source. His ability as a dramatist is evident in the skill with which he expands a thin under-plot into a well-proportioned five-act play.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

JAMES HINTON

## ON CERTAIN INCIDENTS IN BEN JONSON'S LIFE

Bliss, in his edition of Wood's *Athenae Ozonienses*, III, 1254, printed a note to which students of Jonson have not, I think, paid sufficient attention. He there quotes from a book entitled: *The Relection of a Conference Touching the Reall Presence*, 1635, which contains a pamphlet previously published in 1632 by S. E. and called: *The Summe of a Conference Betwixt M. D. Smith Now B. of Chalcedon, and M. Dan. Featly Minister. About the Reall Presence. With the notes of S.E., etc.* The quotation, which I take from the publication of 1635 in a slightly abridged form, runs as follows, pp. 4-5:

In the yeere 1612, Master Daniel Featlie being in France, . . . there came to Paris one M. Knevet, halfe-brother to M. John Foord, an honest & vertuous Gentleman the[n] living in that Cittie.<sup>1</sup> This M. Knevet, being . . . put in mind, that he was mistaken in the matter of Religion . . . tould his brother (M. Foord) he would see one of ours defend it before M. Featlie . . . Withall he acquainted M. Featlie with the business . . . M. Featlie . . . undertooke it. . . . At leingth, upon the third of September, word was sent to M. D. Smith. . . .

On the 4. of September there met at M. Knevets chamber, M. D. Smith, and M. Featly. With M. D. Smith came his cozen M. Rainer; & with M. Featly came one M. John Porie, who had beene a burgeois (as it was said) in the first Parliament in King James his time. There were also present M. John Foord, M. Thomas Rant, M. Ben: Jonson, M. Henrie Constable, and others; not English onlie, but also French, etc.

It seemed to me worth while to follow up the hint thus given. In 1630 Featly published his *Grand Sacrilege of the Church of Rome*, and pp. 285 ff. of that work are taken up with a pamphlet entitled: *The Summe and Substance of A Disputation Betweene M. Dan. Featly, Oponent, and D. Smith the younger, Respondent, (now by the Pope intituled [sic] Bishop of Chalcedon, and Ordinary of all England) At Paris. Sept. 4. 1612. Stylo Novo, touching the Reall Presence in the Sacrament. . . . 1630.* This contains the following passage, pp. 305-6:

In this Relation we have omitted of set purpose all D. Smiths by-discourses, together with his proofes of the maine, because they were against

<sup>1</sup> This cannot have been the dramatist, as an examination of his pedigree in Vivian's *Visitations of Devonshire* shows.



the third Law [i.e., agreement by which the disputation was to be conducted]. And M. Featly at this time tooke no notice of them in particular, but promised in generall to answer them all, when it came to his course to answer: Now he was bound by the Law onely to oppose, and D. Smith onely to give his answers, which are here truly set downe, most of them out of his owne writing, as wee depose, who were present at this Disputation.

I must willingly subscribe to the truth of that, which D. Smith did so voluntarily present to our eyes and eares; And for the rest, which is M. Featlies, none of the adverse party can take any just exception against it.

J. P.

I professe, that all things in this Narration delivered and quoted out of D. Smiths Autographie, are true out of my examination. And of the rest I remember the most, or all: neither can I suspect any party.

B. J.

Now J. P. and B. J. are John Pory and Benjamin Jonson, as is clear from S. E.'s list, and further proof of the identification will be seen in a moment. But who wrote the pamphlet? The phrase, "we have omitted," seems to suggest that J. P. and B. J. were jointly responsible; on the other hand, the language of the last paragraph seems to imply that the pamphlet, once written, was submitted to B. J. for examination. Both are clearly concerned in the composition of the first paragraph quoted. S. E. (*Relection*, p. 2) takes this pamphlet to be by Featly himself, and places little faith, apparently, in these attestations of accuracy, for he says, p. 3: ". . . the Minister . . . doth cite imperfectlie my Lords answers, putting words or peeeces together at his pleasure, and sometimes adding: and obscuring the sence which in the Relation it selfe [i.e., Smith's MS] I find to be distinct and cleere." Let us look, however, a little farther.

Featly touches upon this pamphlet in his *Transubstantiation Exploded*, 1638. On p. 27 he attacks S. E. for his criticism thus: "In my booke (which he so nicknameth) a *great beame* is discovered *in the eye of the Romane Church*; in the relation of the conference appendant thereunto a *mote in your eye*." The implication of this language is that Featly, though the author of the *Grand Sacrilege*, was not of the appended relation.

On p. 30 he says: ". . . he hath flung a dart of Calumny at a Conference of mine signed and subscribed by two witnesses, both named by him, and acknowledged to be present at that disputation in Paris, Anno 1612." Here the language is vague, because Featly

is using the word "Conference" in two senses, that of the report of the conference and that of the conference itself. In the latter sense, the conference was his; in the former it may or may not have been. This passage, however, is of particular interest as placing beyond peradventure the identity of J. P. and B. J., since Jonson and Pory are the only two persons in S. E.'s list that have the right initials. There is, in other words, no question of the "others" who were present; J. P. and B. J. were "named" and "acknowledged."<sup>1</sup>

On p. 35: "I intreat the Reader to take notice that the Protestant relation of the Conference printed 1630, was taken out of the authentically notes of both parties, and confirmed and subscribed by two that were present at the disputation." This passage tells us merely that whoever wrote the pamphlet had Featly's notes to work upon as well as Smith's.

Farther down on the same page is a more definite passage: "First, you charge me with the breach of I know not what condition, by making the Conference more publik then it should have beene. The two noters make mention but of three conditions or lawes made by the company, and assented unto by us before we exchanged any word. . . ." Now the three conditions to be met by the disputants are stated literally at the very beginning of the pamphlet, so that the phrase, "the two noters," would seem to make J. P. and B. J. both responsible for the whole work, not of course for the material drawn from the notes of the disputants, but for the selection and arrangement of that material, for such explanatory and transitional matter as was necessary, and for the translation, as the notes were in Latin.

If we take a middle path, I think we may harmonize all of these statements, that is, if we assume that Pory wrote the pamphlet in consultation with Jonson, who, besides giving him some advice, examined his work and certified to its accuracy.

The facts just brought forth are not merely interesting in themselves, but they have an interesting bearing upon several points in Jonson's life. First, as to his journey to France. Although the passage quoted from the *Relection* has been in print for many years, all of the lives of Jonson say he went to France as governor of Raleigh's

<sup>1</sup> It is curious that in September 20, 1632, Pory should write to Puckering that he had supposed Ben Jonson was dead. When did the collaboration on this pamphlet actually take place?

son in 1613.<sup>1</sup> To be sure, this is the date given twice by Jonson in the *Conversations*. But here, on incontrovertible testimony, we find him in Paris in September, 1612. Either this was a separate visit to France, one of which no trace elsewhere exists, or his stay there began much earlier and lasted much longer that we have hitherto supposed. In either case, there is no contradiction involved. The incidents of which he speaks in the *Conversations* no doubt did happen in 1613. Or else we may suppose that he stayed in France during the greater part of that year, and that 1613 would occupy a larger place in his memory than 1612, so that, speaking loosely and casually, he might naturally say: "When I was in France in 1613."

Let us next consider the problem of the publication of the Folio of 1616. The belief of Fleay and Simpson<sup>2</sup> is that the Folio was to have been brought out in 1612 or 1613 and dedicated to Prince Henry, but that the death of that prince prevented the carrying out of the design. In support of this, Fleay points to the entry of the epigrams, S. R., May 15, 1612, the death of the prince in that year, the fact that in the epigrams and in the *Forest* we can discover no date certainly later than 1611 or 1612, the fact that the annotated masques are all earlier than that year, and that *Catiline*, 1611, is the latest play included. All of this is interesting, and of course correct as far as the dates are concerned and the intention to publish something at least in 1612. But how about the connection with Prince Henry? He did not die until November 6; the entry of the epigrams is on May 15. It is going a little far to invoke the death of the prince to explain the non-publication of a volume entered almost six months earlier. And if the epigrams had been intended to form part of a volume of "works" in 1612 or 1613, would they have been entered separately? Or is it likely that the other parts of that volume would have been entered separately as Fleay assumes? Or, as the epigrams come after the plays in the volume finally issued, why should they have been entered first? Doesn't the theory demand that the epigrams should come first, or that they should at least have a separate pagination? I submit that there is no *evidence* of an intention to

<sup>1</sup> The suggestion by Ward, II, 315, "or in the previous year, possibly on account of the cessation of all Court festivities by reason of the death of Henry Prince of Wales," was a pure guess due to Gifford.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Notes and Queries*, 9 s., V, 337.

publish in 1612 anything more than a volume of epigrams, and that there is no *evidence* connecting that volume with Prince Henry.

Now, why were the epigrams not published? Prince Henry died six months after the entry and there was plenty of time to get out the epigrams several times over in the interval. The reason probably lay in Jonson's absence from London. Suppose that he made an arrangement with Stepneth to print the epigrams about the beginning of May. The publisher immediately makes record of his right to publish the poems of the most talked-of writer of the day. But Jonson is very soon made governor of Raleigh's son, and compelled to go with him to Paris. Being Jonson, he says to the printer, "No publishing during my absence." (I hold firmly to the belief that he supervised the publication of the 1616 volume, in spite of the article by Van Dam and Stoffel in 1900.) His stay in Paris endures all of the remaining part of 1612 and perhaps the greater part of 1613, for we cannot trace him in London until Somerset's marriage in December, 1613, and even then not with certainty. When he returns his plans have changed, or perhaps the publisher's. Mr. Simpson himself suggests that Stepneth may have died at this time, and there is no evidence that he did any printing after that date. In any case there was a transfer of interest of some kind, and nothing was printed until 1616 when the volume appeared as we have it.

It may be asked how this explanation accounts for the fact that we can discover no date in the epigrams and *Forest* later than 1611. The answer is while it is true that we can not prove that any one of the poems in these collections was written later than that date, there are any number of them that *may* have been written later and in regard to which we cannot ascertain any date at all. It is a pure begging of the question to determine the date of a collection of miscellaneous pieces in this way.

It may be asked how it accounts for the omission of the epitaph on Prince Henry.<sup>1</sup> My answer is that I do not think we are justified in accepting that poem as Jonson's; Gifford's verdict seems to me to be substantially correct.

How then about the omission of the lines to Somerset on his marriage? It is perfectly clear why Jonson in 1616 should not care to

<sup>1</sup> *Notes and Queries*, loc. cit.

son in 1613.<sup>1</sup> To be sure, this is the date given twice by Jonson in the *Conversations*. But here, on incontrovertible testimony, we find him in Paris in September, 1612. Either this was a separate visit to France, one of which no trace elsewhere exists, or his stay there began much earlier and lasted much longer than we have hitherto supposed. In either case, there is no contradiction involved. The incidents of which he speaks in the *Conversations* no doubt did happen in 1613. Or else we may suppose that he stayed in France during the greater part of that year, and that 1613 would occupy a larger place in his memory than 1612, so that, speaking loosely and casually, he might naturally say: "When I was in France in 1613."

Let us next consider the problem of the publication of the Folio of 1616. The belief of Fleay and Simpson<sup>2</sup> is that the Folio was to have been brought out in 1612 or 1613 and dedicated to Prince Henry, but that the death of that prince prevented the carrying out of the design. In support of this, Fleay points to the entry of the epigrams, S. R., May 15, 1612, the death of the prince in that year, the fact that in the epigrams and in the *Forest* we can discover no date certainly later than 1611 or 1612, the fact that the annotated masques are all earlier than that year, and that *Catiline*, 1611, is the latest play included. All of this is interesting, and of course correct as far as the dates are concerned and the intention to publish something at least in 1612. But how about the connection with Prince Henry? He did not die until November 6; the entry of the epigrams is on May 15. It is going a little far to invoke the death of the prince to explain the non-publication of a volume entered almost six months earlier. And if the epigrams had been intended to form part of a volume of "works" in 1612 or 1613, would they have been entered separately? Or is it likely that the other parts of that volume would have been entered separately as Fleay assumes? Or, as the epigrams come after the plays in the volume finally issued, why should they have been entered first? Doesn't the theory demand that the epigrams should come first, or that they should at least have a separate pagination? I submit that there is no *evidence* of an intention to

<sup>1</sup> The suggestion by Ward, II, 315, "or in the previous year, possibly on account of the cessation of all Court festivities by reason of the death of Henry Prince of Wales," was a pure guess due to Gifford.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Notes and Queries*, 9 s., V, 337.

publish in 1612 anything more than a volume of epigrams, and that there is no *evidence* connecting that volume with Prince Henry.

Now, why were the epigrams not published? Prince Henry died six months after the entry and there was plenty of time to get out the epigrams several times over in the interval. The reason probably lay in Jonson's absence from London. Suppose that he made an arrangement with Stepneth to print the epigrams about the beginning of May. The publisher immediately makes record of his right to publish the poems of the most talked-of writer of the day. But Jonson is very soon made governor of Raleigh's son, and compelled to go with him to Paris. Being Jonson, he says to the printer, "No publishing during my absence." (I hold firmly to the belief that he supervised the publication of the 1616 volume, in spite of the article by Van Dam and Stoffel in 1900.) His stay in Paris endures all of the remaining part of 1612 and perhaps the greater part of 1613, for we cannot trace him in London until Somerset's marriage in December, 1613, and even then not with certainty. When he returns his plans have changed, or perhaps the publisher's. Mr. Simpson himself suggests that Stepneth may have died at this time, and there is no evidence that he did any printing after that date. In any case there was a transfer of interest of some kind, and nothing was printed until 1616 when the volume appeared as we have it.

It may be asked how this explanation accounts for the fact that we can discover no date in the epigrams and *Forest* later than 1611. The answer is while it is true that we can not prove that any one of the poems in these collections was written later than that date, there are any number of them that *may* have been written later and in regard to which we cannot ascertain any date at all. It is a pure begging of the question to determine the date of a collection of miscellaneous pieces in this way.

It may be asked how it accounts for the omission of the epitaph on Prince Henry.<sup>1</sup> My answer is that I do not think we are justified in accepting that poem as Jonson's; Gifford's verdict seems to me to be substantially correct.

How then about the omission of the lines to Somerset on his marriage? It is perfectly clear why Jonson in 1616 should not care to

<sup>1</sup> *Notes and Queries*, loc. cit.



print those lines. But it is perfectly possible at the same time that they were intended to be published and that when the murder of Overbury became known in 1615 Jonson canceled them and substituted Epigram 65 in their place. I do not assert this as a fact, or even as probable, but there is nothing to prove the supposition absurd or inadmissible.

The only really serious problem, in short, is the omission of *Bartholomew Fair*. No doubt, this is difficult to explain, but the position taken by Fleay and Simpson does not account for it, unless they are prepared to go to the length of asserting that the volume was actually in type by the time that play was written. If not, why should the play have been left out? If so, why should publication be delayed? A reasonable explanation of the omission is that the play was very likely a good drawing card, and that it was thought unwise to print it so soon.

However, I do not see that I am called upon to account for all such omissions. It is sufficient to point out that the plausible theory of Fleay and Simpson is at present only a plausible theory, and that we may explain the failure of the epigrams to appear in 1612 without calling upon Prince Henry's death to assist us.

Thirdly, this pamphlet gives us a clear insight into the character of Jonson's life-long interest in theology and in the argumentative struggle constantly going on between the Roman and Protestant churches. Jonson became a Catholic in 1598; how literally we are to take Drummond's statement that he remained "12 years a Papist" we cannot of course tell, but it is doubtless practically accurate, though it does not enable us to determine the day and hour when he abandoned that faith. It is certain enough, however, that from this document we learn the exact character both of his adoption of Catholicism and of his reconversion. Both were of a purely intellectual nature, the fruit, that is, of purely intellectual processes, so far as such things can be. One need not for a moment deny that he was a man, as Gifford says, of deep religious feeling. There is evidence enough for that. But there is no evidence that he had an instinctive preference for either form of Christianity, that he was led in either conversion by any feeling that either church would more thoroughly satisfy his emotional nature, that his convictions were at



all influenced by the need of an authoritative church, by a longing for Christian unity, by an aesthetic appreciation of Catholic ritual, or in fact by any of the multifarious emotional appeals that Catholicism has made and makes to many men of many natures. There is, in other words, not the least hint of the sentimentalist or the mystic. When Jonson was in prison in 1598, he took his religion "on trust." That is to say, he felt himself unable to disprove the statement of the priest that the logical interpretation of the biblical text supported the Catholic claim. When he came to examine the matter for himself, and at length, this view of the case ceased to give him intellectual satisfaction, and he became once more a Protestant. It was discussions of the general type of that contained in our pamphlet, to many of which he must have listened and in many of which he must have taken a share, that carried weight and turned the scale.

Thus I demonstrate it: *By hic calix* you meane *hic sanguis*: but *sanguis Christi* is not *proprie testamentum*.

*Negatur minor*, saith D. Smith.

*Probatur* (quoth M. Featly,) No substantiall part of the Testator is properly his Testament: But the blood of Christ is a substantiall part of the Testator: *Ergo*, it is not properly his last Will and Testament.

In his Syllogisme D. Smith denied the Major, affirming, that if any man should signe any thing with his blood, that blood being an authentickall signe of his Will, might be properly called his Testament.<sup>1</sup>

Whether such argument, thoroughly alien as it is to the temper of the present day and resting as it does upon obviously false analogies, be likely to avail much for salvation, everyone must decide for himself. We must at the same time admit that it is the kind of argument that determined whether Jonson was or was not to remain a Catholic.<sup>2</sup>

Perhaps it will not be out of place to speak here of other tantalizing glimpses into his intellectual life at this period that are afforded by two MS trifles that I have never seen referred to.

The first has to do with a letter to Jonson by Joseph Webbe, concerning whom see *D.N.B.* It is a very long letter in Sl. 1466 ff.,

<sup>1</sup> P. 302.

<sup>2</sup> Castelain, who has a somewhat different explanation of Jonson's reconversion and one that seems to me out of harmony with the poet's character (*Ben Jonson*, 1907, 124, note) neatly disposes of the inconvenient "12 years" by supposing that there may have been a misreading of XII for VII.

203 f., relating to a treatise on Latin versification of which Webbe was the author. A Latin version of the letter in a different hand is in the same MS, 354-72.

F. 203. "A Letter briefly touching the large extent & infinite use, of yt little booke called *Entheatus Materialis primus*, lately written by ye Author of yt booke, to his deare & lovinge frend Mr. Benjamin Johnson. And his anwere." [*Sic.* Unfortunately the answer of Jonson is not in the MS, and the title-page of the Latin version of the letter makes no mention of it.]

F. 204. "Mr. Benjamin Johnson, eldest sonne of our Brittainē muses: J. W. wisheth Bayes; a marble, or some brasen statua; & perpetuall memory.

"Deare Brother

"Within ye circuite of my best acquaintance, I find none of Apollo's Judges to grace more ye seate of his Justice either with gravity of person, multiciplicite of reading, or depht of understanding; than you doe. Nor find I any, from w'm I should more joyfull receive applause for good; or more patiently tollerate, rebuke for ill; than from ye doome of yours discretion. Give mee therefore leave to intreate none but you\* to lift the Balance betweene my last booke, & some ill Savouring breath of Malice, now call'd emulation; & to make a just report of both theyre valeses."

\*Enth: mat: 1. us.

Webbe then goes on to complain of the envious strictures that have been passed upon his work, to ask Jonson to judge between him and his critics, to give a complex mathematical demonstration of the principle of his book, and at length to conclude—

"Though much more may be sayde in ye behalfe of this little booke: yet let this suffice for ye present. And let report & it bee judg'd by your opinion. Meane while I rest.

[*sic*]

Glassenbury house  
in Smithfield. Jan:  
20, 1628 [-9]:

Your devoted frend  
and brother  
Joseph. Webbe."

The work of which Webbe speaks was entitled *Usus et Authoritas sive Entheatus*, etc., 1626. It dealt chiefly with the pentameter and hexameter, though the principles were applicable to all forms of versification, and apparently to any language. It aroused some controversy, of which there are many traces in the MS, the greater part of which is taken up with pieces in one way and another bearing on it. Arber, *Transcript*, V, lviii, says that Joseph Webbe was granted

a patent "for the teaching of the languages after a newe sort by him devised, and alsoe the printing of the booke and selling them," but the date of the patent is not given, and it apparently refers to other related enterprises on the part of Webbe (see *D.N.B.*).

In the same MS, f. 16, is the following, probably in the hand of Webbe:

Coppie of a noate of Mr. Morleys. had fro Oxford. Whereas Caleb Morley Mr of Arts & sometymes fellowe of Baliel Colledg in ye Universitie of Oxon hath intended & laboured a speedie and certaine Course for ye attaying & retayninge of languages & other partes of good literature purposed for ye generall ease & benifit of ye studious in either kinde. We whose names are under written & of ye same Universitie purpose & promise our best furtherance & assistance therein on his behalfe by our Countenance & Labours to our powers not onlie to welcome but also to helpe such a labour pretended for ours provided that any Contribution of money from us be alwayes excepted."

I could not decipher all of the signatures, which are of course not originals. There are fourteen of them in all, and they belong to Sir Robert Cotton, Sir Henry Spilman, Dr. Rives (?) Advoc. Regis, Dr. Duck, Cancillar, Londi., Dr. Baskeville, Med. Dr., Dr. Andrews, Med. Dr., Mr. S——, Theolog., Mr. Adsworth (?), Theolog., Mr. Selden, Gentl., Mr. Benjam. Johnson, Mr. Mathew Bust, Mr. of Eaton School, Mr. Farnaby, Heynes (?), Mr. Robinson Scholar of Winchester, S.

These names do not require much comment. I believe Dr. Andrews is the Dr. Andrewes whose poems are in *Harl.* 4955. Mr. Robinson is probably the Edward Robinson elected to Winchester in 1622, as the William Robinson of 1627 would be too young. The date of the note is between 1628 and 1630, for Duck did not become chancellor of the diocese of London until 1628 or shortly after, whereas Matthew Bust was Master of Eton from 1611 to 1630.

About Caleb Morley little is known. From the printed register of the University and from Foster's *Alumni Oxonienses*, we find that he matriculated 5 March 1602, aged 16, proceeded B.A. 26 October, 1605, and M.A. 20th June, 1611, and became Rector of Stalbridge, Dorset, in 1616. According to Hutchin's *History of Dorset*, 111, 681, his successor was instituted in 1621; apparently, Morley must have been deprived as the result of the suit against him of which we find

some particulars in the *Calendar of State Papers, Dom.*, under November 24, 1619, May 10, 1620, and December ?, 1621. On October 28, 1624, Conway writes to the bishop of London saying that "the King wishes his opinion on a new alphabet invented by Mr. Morley, a minister, for the more easy attaining of languages, for the sole printing and publishing of which he requests a patent." On March 6, 1627, there is a grant "to Caleb Morley, of the sole right, for 21 years, of printing and publishing a New Method for the Help of Memory and grounding of Scholars in several languages." This patent is also given by Arber, *Transcript*, V, lviii, but without date. I have not been able to find that Morley published anything on the subject, but there is an unsigned account of a newly invented alphabet in this same MS which is very likely his. If so, it conveys a high estimate of his competence, for it is founded on the soundest principles, though they may not always be properly carried out.

WILLIAM DINSMORE BRIGGS

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

